





# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

# QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

VOL. XXII.—JULY, 1897.—No. 87.

---

## CATHOLIC SECONDARY EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

IN a previous number of this REVIEW<sup>1</sup> the present writer set forth in an article entitled "The Idea of a Parochial School" the scheme of primary education formulated by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. He showed how the faithful carrying-out of the Council's ordinances would secure an efficient system of elementary education. In many dioceses the organization of the parochial schools is already so perfect that they can challenge comparison with the richly-endowed public schools. It is hoped that this perfect organization will soon obtain everywhere, so that the excellence of the work done, as well as the sacrifices made in our parochial school system, shall get from American statesmen that hearty recognition which is now being bestowed on a similar system in England. Doubtless the day will come when enlightened men of all parties here will recognize that the enforced divorce between religion and education is injurious to the best interests of the State; that parents have an inalienable right to have their children educated according to the dictates of their conscience; and that denominational schools are as worthy of State support as any other, provided they give an equally good education in secular branches. Meanwhile, our separate parochial school system has to be upheld at any and every sacrifice; the faith of Catholic children has to be safeguarded; and the secular education given has to be kept abreast of the times, so as to put our boys and girls on the same plane as their neighbors for attaining temporal advantages.

---

<sup>1</sup> No. 63, July, 1891.

The purpose of the present article is to treat of Catholic secondary education in the United States—of its province, its present condition, and its requirements.

By secondary education is meant that which holds a middle place between the groundwork of the primary school and the finished work—whether useful or ornamental—of the university. It supplies the student with the framework of a liberal education. It unfolds to him the most perfect languages and literatures of ancient and modern times, enables him to unravel the thoughts and discover the art of the greatest authors. It furnishes him with precepts and models to practice composition in its varied kinds, inculcates the requisites of good writing and speaking, and puts at his command such a knowledge of the form and substance of literature as will fit him to pursue gracefully and efficiently professional studies or some other avocation in life. In mathematics and science secondary education supplies all that is needed for sound mental discipline, as well as for the taking up of purely technical or scientific pursuits.

The youth who has pursued a good course of secondary education is fitted, on the one hand, for the higher and broader culture of the university, and, on the other, he is well-equipped for the work of life; his mind is so well disciplined that he can bring it to bear on all problems that present themselves, and his store of knowledge is such as to be, when ripened by experience, sufficient for all practical purposes. It may, indeed, be said that secondary is by far the most important of all phases of education. A country or a people is, as a rule, what its secondary schools make it. For, whilst the university gives perfect training only to the few, and the primary schools supply the elementary educational wants of the many, it is the secondary schools which train the minds and set in motion the brains of the bulk of thinkers. Germany's wonderful progress in recent years has been mostly due to the training given in her *Gymnasien*; the greatness of England is distinctly traceable to the influence of her secondary schools, such as Eton, Harrow, Winchester, Rugby and the others. This fact is so well recognized in England that, whenever her great men are spoken of, the secondary school in which they were educated is invariably mentioned. And the rapid strides which the United States are making in literature, science and art are the distinct outcome of the wide diffusion of secondary education.

The benefits of secondary education are within easy reach of non-Catholics in the United States under a twofold form. The public high schools, which exist in nearly all our cities, and which are supported by public taxes, supply a fair amount of it, and their work is supplemented by the well-endowed State and other col-

leges spread throughout the land. There seems to be no public institution in the United States which occupies itself fully and exclusively with secondary studies in the same sense as the *Lycees* of France, the *Gymnasien* of Germany, the *Public Schools* of England. The average high school or academy does not go far enough, and the ordinary colleges, as well as many of our so-called universities, whilst really not going beyond the proper limits of secondary education in letters and science, usually embrace some branches of university studies or some technical schools. This double system of the high school and college puts secondary education in the United States on a higher level than in any other country. And, whilst the high-sounding name of "university," which many of our American colleges assume, must be considered a somewhat boastful misnomer, except in some few cases, where it is used to describe an aggregation of technical schools, still it must be admitted that nowhere else in the world are so many opportunities given to such large numbers to attain an advanced degree of both liberal and useful knowledge. This high intellectual and practical training which is now to be had by almost every citizen of the United States is causing, and will cause still more in the future, a keen competition in all walks of life; and the day is not far distant when any one who aspires in this country to a position above that of laborer or husbandman must be equipped not only with primary but with secondary education, whether literary, scientific or technical.

Considering, then, the great importance of secondary education in itself, and the facility with which it may be attained by the modern American citizen, it cannot but be of benefit to examine how Catholics in the United States are situated with regard to it, what drawbacks exist for our people in this respect, and what ameliorations are desirable.

It must be admitted at the outset that no organized system of secondary education exists for Catholics in the United States. We have a primary system known under the name of parochial schools which are designed to do for our people what the ward or public schools do for their neighbors. We have a Catholic University which is being endowed by the general Catholic body, and which already offers a varied curriculum of real university studies. But between these two extremes there is no organized plan of intermediate, or secondary studies. With the exception of a few institutions which are due to individual munificence, such as the Catholic High School of Philadelphia, and the Creighton College of Omaha, we have no free high schools, and no endowed colleges. It is owing to the devotedness of the various religious orders that our youth can aspire to any distinctly Catholic higher

education between the parochial school and the university. Of the fifty or more Catholic institutions of secondary education in the United States, exclusive of seminaries, all but two or three have been founded and are conducted by the religious orders. The cause of this state of things is easily explained. In the absence of endowments our Catholic secondary schools depend for subsistence on the very small fees which the general poverty of our people can afford to give. Now, all who are at all acquainted with educational matters know that with no other resources but the fees of students it would be utterly impossible to build, equip, and man an educational institution. It is only bodies of men who give their own services for nothing, and whose personal requirements for living are reduced to a minimum, that can dispense any education worthy of the name without endowments.

It is to be feared that very few realize the amount of sacrifice made by the religious orders in this respect, just as very few realize the excellent work they are doing, notwithstanding the notorious financial disadvantages under which they labor. Anyhow, Catholic secondary education is bound up with these institutions at present; and it is in connection with them that its present condition, the work it is accomplishing, the drawbacks from which it suffers, the changes and improvements to be made may be best considered.

It is very hard to arrive at a just estimate of the work done not only by a Catholic but by any institution of learning in the United States. There is no standard by which to judge it. There is no uniform line of demarcation here, as there is in other countries, between primary, secondary, and university studies. There is no uniform standard required as elsewhere for entrance on professional studies, or for higher service under the government. Almost the only criterion by which to judge of American colleges is their programme of studies, and the men they turn out. This latter criterion may be, of course, very misleading. Men of exceptional talent and ambition may attain to greatness in spite of educational disadvantages. And thus it is of itself no sure indication of the actual or habitual worth of a given school or college that such or such a prominent man happened to be educated in it. Of course if a relatively large number of great men have been educated at various times in a given institution, and if their greatness is chiefly the result of their education, it is safe and right to conclude that their *alma mater* is indeed a nursery of great men. But, in a country like America, where, so very often, *c'est la position qui fait l'homme*, and where prominent positions are secured not so much through educational fitness as by political talent and influence, it would be very unwise to judge of given institutions or

systems by the number of persons holding high offices who were educated in them. The fact that a certain college educated a man or two, who afterwards became Mayor of a large city, or Governor of a State, or Judge of Supreme Court, or even President of the United States, may be no proof whatever that the credit of such distinction is due to the education received. It is well known that the above and other high offices have been filled in the United States by men who had little or no liberal culture. It is of special importance to bear this in mind when judging of the work done by Catholic colleges and schools. It is sometimes said reproachfully of them that they cannot point to even a moderately large number of great men produced by them. Those who speak thus forget or ignore the prejudices that have all along existed against Catholics, the discrimination so often exercised against them in selecting for high offices, the comparative poverty of our people, and the consequent want of social influence to forward their claims to eminence. It is very probable, however, that this state of things will not long continue; and the day is fast approaching when true merit properly tested, and not political influence, will be the passport to high office in America as it is in most other civilized countries. Then we shall have a standard whereby to judge of the relative value of educational systems and institutions. It is safe to presume that when that day comes, our Catholic colleges here will be able to compete as successfully as they have done in other countries, where there is a fair field and no favor. At least, this is a conclusion forced on any one who carefully examines the programme of studies pursued in most of our colleges and compares it with that of similar non-Catholic institutions. The average graduate of our Catholic colleges receives as much solid liberal culture as the graduates of the majority of other colleges and so-called universities. In ancient and modern languages, in pure mathematics, and in many of the fine arts our graduates probably excel; and in most of our colleges there is a course of mental philosophy which far surpasses the corresponding course given elsewhere.

But, whilst maintaining the excellence of our colleges along certain lines and for certain ends, it must be acknowledged that they are inadequate to supply the kind and amount of secondary education which this age and our country demand, and which is within easy reach of non-Catholics. This inadequacy arises from no fault of our colleges but from the special nature of their organization. They are private, unendowed institutions. As such they depend entirely on the fees of pupils for subsistence. Consequently, they cannot open their doors to the large body of Catholic youth who are too poor to pay even a moderate fee; and they

can afford to teach only such subjects as do not require expensive installation. Hence the field of their labors is circumscribed, and the kind of education they give is governed by economic considerations.

The principle, *prius est esse quam ita esse*, necessarily regulates the policy of a private, unendowed institution. The necessity of having to act continually on such a principle is a drag on all progress, especially in educational matters. Let us see how it influences the quality and quantity of education given by our colleges.

It will be readily granted that the revenue of our colleges derived from fees of students is barely sufficient to pay the interest on buildings and grounds and to meet the necessary current expenses. There is not a Catholic college in the United States which could afford to pay even a moderate salary to its professors, whilst safeguarding the true interests and requirements of education. Even the colleges conducted by religious who make profession of poverty have usually a hard struggle for existence; and in most cases funds derived elsewhere than from pupils' fees are sunk in the college foundation. This state of things necessarily hampers the best-willed educationists. It causes them to do or to omit many things against their better judgment. For, not even a religious order can afford to carry on a college at financial loss, or to invest in improvements from which no immediate return can be expected.

Let us illustrate these views by reference to what ought to exist and what actually exists amongst us. Everyone knows that any institution or system of secondary learning worthy of the name requires of its students a standard for entrance, a standard in the various steps of the course, and a well-defined standard for its completion. Thus, there is here an entrance examination for high schools and for the non-Catholic colleges. In most European countries there is, besides, an age requirement for entrance, as well as a superannuation rule. Thus, in the great public schools of England already referred to, a boy is not admitted after fourteen nor kept after eighteen years of age.

Now, there is not one of our Catholic colleges in America that can afford to insist on such standard for either entrance on or the pursuit of its regular course of studies. Even our best and oldest colleges have under their roof mere children who are fit only for an elementary school. In fact, there is an open bid made for such pupils. It is nothing unusual to find a Catholic institution advertising itself at one and the same time as a university, a college, an academy, and a preparatory school. It is clear that the standard of studies as well as tone and character suffer from such an ad-

mixture. A worse feature connected with entrance to our colleges is the admission of boys, or rather, young men, as old as eighteen years or more, who are utterly unfit to take up courses corresponding to their age, and for whom reasons of economy provide "special classes." In the same way, and for the same reasons, there is no fixed standard insisted on for the pursuit of studies. At most a boy who is found unfit for promotion at the regular time is kept back for a term or more. Afterwards he has to be permitted to creep along in a higher class as best he can. It is probable that not one of our colleges can afford to exclude boys on grounds of mere dullness or indolence. Yet the presence of such boys is an impediment to the progress of others, and schools which are enabled by endowments to follow an independent line of action will not permit those who cannot take their class within a reasonable term, to remain on roll.

From another and more important point of view, that of the quality and amount of education given, the peculiar character of our colleges, and the straitened conditions under which they work render them inadequate to supply the needs of the large body of our people. As our colleges are, without exception, conducted by religious orders or by priests, the course of studies which they offer is, as a rule, the traditional classical one, which is undoubtedly the best preparation for the priesthood, or for the liberal professions, as well as the best foundation of all liberal culture. But our age and country evidently demand an entirely different system of education for the majority of boys and young men. This is the age and America is the home of applied sciences. Under these circumstances, for the one boy out of ten who may hope to make a living out of the fruits of a classical education, nine others will find their time and energy wasted to a large extent unless they get an opportunity of technical training also. Electrical, mechanical and civil engineering, mining, skilled workmanship in manufactures, expert methods in business—these are the fields where the largest amount of valuable livelihoods may be obtained. Yet our Catholic youth is, as a body, excluded from them. Our Catholic laity have not one-tenth of the representation that they ought to have in these and other walks of laudable, secular ambition. Nor can our colleges, in their present condition, supply the training necessary for success in these pursuits. This technical training would require the employment of well-paid lay instructors, and the installation and support of very expensive apparatus. None of our colleges could afford the expenditure necessary for carrying on such work in an efficient manner.

Another prominent defect in our system of secondary education, such as it exists, is the tacking on to it below and above portions

of education which have nothing to do with it, and which could be far better attended to separately. We have already referred to the admission to our colleges of boys, young and old, who have not yet gone through the curriculum of elementary studies. At the other end of many of these institutions we have what are called post-graduate courses which profess to supply university training. And thus we often have the A. B. C., the A. B., and the M. A. congregated together under the same roof, and under, practically, the same discipline.

Whilst everyone will admit that the presence of the first and last elements is quite anomalous, it is worth considering whether it would not be well to make a clear separation between the two parts of the seven years' course of secondary education. This separation is made in the non-Catholic institutions and systems all around us. The public high school or the private academy covers the first three or four years of secondary studies, and prepares for the college which occupies itself exclusively with the last four.

We have not a solitary example of this separation. We have not a single college which is exclusively devoted to the more advanced portion of secondary education. The truth is that none of our colleges is strong enough numerically and financially to cut loose from the long and somewhat straggling tail of its academical and elementary *clientèle*. Still the advantages of such a separation are obvious. Indeed many of our institutions feel the necessity of attempting it. Thus they put the younger boys in separate apartments and under separate supervision. But this separation can be, from the nature of things, only very partial. It often happens that a young boy is in the same class with those who are by many years his seniors, and, *vice versa*, an older but backward boy finds himself on the benches with those who are little more than half his size. And, in divers other ways and places, young and old, big and small are brought together, each category influencing more or less the other. It is pretty clear that this state of things is not at all so satisfactory as would be a complete separation of the two classes of students and of studies. Separation is advantageous both for the acquisition of knowledge and for the formation of character. The average pupil of a separate high school or academy receives a better intellectual training than the corresponding pupil of the three years' or academic department of our colleges. The high school, having an existence and object of its own, aims at a certain completeness or perfection. It feels that it has to give the finishing touch to the education of most of its pupils. It graduates them for business, or for technical schools, or for colleges. The high salaries it can offer secure

a correspondingly high class of teachers. These teachers feel in the work of their separate establishment far more interest than if it were merely the tail-end of a more pretentious institution. Their principal is able to concentrate his mind on the work of three or four years with far more intensity than if he had to direct also the work of three or four other years. Local needs and opportunities are borne in mind in framing the programme of studies. The greatest good of the greatest number is steadily and fearlessly sought, independent of the personal likings or dislikings, whims or fancies of the few. The boy who proceeds from the high school to college takes up his new work with a fresh interest. He finds himself in changed surroundings. He is in far more favorable condition for sustained effort than the corresponding freshman in a Catholic college, who is already anything but fresh, who is beginning to grow tired of the same scenes, and faces, and routine which he has been experiencing already for three or four years, and which he knows will remain practically unchanged for four years to come.

Then, too, development of character, which is, after all, one of the principal ends of education, gains by this separation of which we are speaking. Younger boys can be controlled and disciplined in a manner suited to their age far better in a separate institution than in the annex of a college; and youths who range from seventeen or eighteen to twenty-one or twenty-two years of age can and ought to be handled in a manner becoming their years and not to be held under the same *régime* as children. Of course, a distinction of treatment and discipline exists for these two categories in our colleges; but restraint becomes the more repulsive for youngsters in presence of the privileges granted the seniors; and much rational liberty has to be denied to the seniors through fear of disedification of the juniors. Speaking of this subject, I cannot refrain from expressing my opinion, which is founded on long years of observation in several countries, that the senior or older students of our Catholic colleges do not get sufficient rational liberty, sufficient opportunities for training themselves to exercise self control, and self-respect, nor sufficient self-government and initiative.

However we may decry the abuse that license generates in non-Catholic institutions, yet we have to admit that the students of such places have an *esprit de corps*, an attachment to *alma mater*, a way of managing their literary and athletic associations, a spirit of enterprise and of self-reliance which are not found in near the same measure among us. It is to be feared that our young men are kept too long tied to the apron-strings of prefects and masters. This explains how so many of them when sent out into the

world are as unbent bows, exposed to snap and break in a disastrous manner. Surely, with the material we have to work on, and with the chastening and molding aid of the Sacraments and of the Divine Spirit, we ought to be able to train our youth to the use without the abuse of liberty.

The above-mentioned and other deficiencies in our existing institutions of secondary education are to be ascribed, as we have already intimated, not to any dereliction of duty on the part of the bodies that conduct them, but to the unfavorable conditions under which they are conducted. It even redounds to the honor of the Catholic Church that in it alone is to be found the self-sacrifice which succeeds in carrying on, without any aid from within or from without, establishments of higher education. Apart from the catchpenny institutions known as "business colleges," which are beside consideration in connection with true education, there is not outside the Church, from one end of this country to the other, a single college that attempts to do the work of higher education without endowments. So far, then, from finding fault with our colleges, such as they are, right-minded people cannot but admire the heroic work done under such grave disadvantages. But the self-sacrificing zeal for education displayed by the religious orders—especially as its best efforts must fall, as we have seen, short of the mark—should be no justification for apathy on the part of the general Catholic body in this matter. It has often occurred to the writer that the sacrifices made by the religious orders have indirectly done harm, inasmuch as they have removed from the minds of Catholics all idea of the duty and necessity of contributing to the support of higher education. Even Catholics of large means scarcely ever think nowadays of endowing anything connected with education. Yet education, to be as efficient and as widespread as it should be, is in absolute need of endowments. This question of endowments and of public interest and control is the key to the educational problem that confronts us. And it is through it alone that can be effected the much-needed improvements.

The improvements in our present system of higher education which we would suggest as both necessary and feasible are two-fold—the establishing of free high schools in all the chief centres of Catholic population, and the founding and endowing of a certain number of colleges properly so-called. These improvements could be effected either in connection with existing institutions or separately.

To anyone who reflects seriously on the matter it must be obvious that the Catholic high school is a required complement of parochial schools. For, if it is expedient to give our children a

distinctly Catholic education in elementary branches, it is certainly unwise to throw them out as a body on the world with only such attainments as can be acquired in the parochial schools. Be these attainments ever so perfect, as far as they go, they are utterly inadequate to secure what may be called the middle-class positions to which the talents and character of a large proportion of our youth would eminently entitle them had they only got the chance of higher training.

The prevailing policy of confining the Church's corporate efforts in education to the parochial school necessarily relegates our boys and girls to a secondary place in the race of life. To speak here of the former only, who are the greater sufferers, how can the parochial school-boy be expected to compete, not only with his neighbor of the ward school, but with the high-school graduate? The former may know how to read, write and cipher; he may know enough even to keep the accounts of his father's small store; or his exceptional talents may push him to the front; or he may have the means of providing himself with higher education. But, as belonging to the ordinary class of parochial school-boys, and as an outcome of the incompleteness of our Catholic educational system, he becomes by the force of circumstances a "hewer of wood" for his high-school neighbor. The latter was admitted to the high school on the strength of his talents and previous record. If he entered the commercial department he has there learnt enough to enable him to embrace any business pursuit; or, if he belonged to the academic department, he has made sufficient progress in liberal studies to fit him to take up those proper to some profession, or to enter a university; or, again, if he has had the advantage of the manual training which is offered in many high schools, he finds himself equipped with attainments which will give him a ready and comprehensive grasp of whatever trade he may choose to pursue. In either case the high-school graduate goes forth from the State institution endowed with a fair share of advanced knowledge and possessed of the power and influence which that knowledge gives. The parochial school-boy is no match for him in the competition for success in life. It is a case of warfare analogous to that sometimes carried on with the rude weapons of the semi-civilized against the keen, deadly-precise arms of civilization. Extraordinary talents and moral worth may sometimes give the advantage to the less highly educated, just as dauntless courage and headlong bravery have more than once brought victory to the stone hatchet, boomerang or arrow against rifle, sword and cannon. But, in the one case, as in the other, there can be no doubt as to where victory will be in the end. As surely as the undisciplined heroism of the barbarian must go

down before the serried square and bristling phalanx of disciplined troops, so, too, must the imperfectly educated, how great soever their natural gifts and talents may be, yield to the discipline, the culture, the manifold resources which higher education gives.

It is needless to dwell further on the existence and results of this inferiority to which the incompleteness of our educational system condemns the vast mass of our Catholic youth. *Ça saute aux yeux*, as the French say. Nor dare we ask the question whether this state of things ought to continue. Our own self-respect, the honor of God's Church, the interests of generations yet unborn answer with a million voices: No! But a far more difficult and delicate matter is to suggest an adequate and feasible remedy.

An ideal remedy would be to have some generous, far-seeing Catholic, like the late Mr. Cahill, of Philadelphia, build and endow a Catholic high school.

There could be few more permanently useful investments for wealth than this; and the founder of a well-equipped high school should be regarded as amongst the greatest benefactors of his co-religionists. The number of such benefactors seems to be very limited, especially amongst us; but it is probable that several of them would be found were the merits of this particular question put before them by the proper authorities.

Another way of attaining the same end would be to have the several parishes of a district unite in raising funds for the erection and support of a high school. This plan ought to be quite feasible in centres where there are twenty or more parishes. Each parish would not find it burdensome to keep, say, ten pupils at the high school. This could be done at a cost of less than one thousand dollars a year.

A third and more economic plan would be to have the parishes make arrangements with the Catholic colleges already existing in a locality. It is probable that some of these institutions would be willing to devote a sufficient portion of their buildings and faculty to the purposes of a high school in return for the foundation of a certain number of free scholarships by the parishes. Of course they should, further, give a reasonable guarantee of efficiency and reasonable privileges of inspection and control to those interested. We believe that the increased and definite sphere of usefulness offered by such an arrangement would justify our colleges in accepting it, just as the economic, yet reliable, terms it would secure for the parishes should urge them to propose it.

But, whatever may be thought of the relative feasibility or advisability of these several plans, some one of them should be adopted. Our parochial school system should be supplemented

everywhere by the high school conducted as a public institution, controlled by a representative board of trustees, insisting on a certain standard for the entrance to and pursuit of its course of studies, which should be mapped out to meet local needs and opportunities. Such an institution would secure two excellent results. It would, in the first place, put a fair amount of higher education within the reach of the masses of deserving Catholic boys who are at present precluded from it, and thus put them on a level all along the line with their neighbors. And, secondly, it would have a most salutary reflex effect on the parochial schools. The annual examination for entrance to the high school would be a strong stimulus for the pupils of the lower schools, and an incentive to healthy rivalry between them. Each pupil who aspires to enter the high school would be urged on to greater efforts by the foreknowledge that his proficiency would be tested by an impartial tribunal, and compared with that of his classmates. And the thought that the school as a whole would be judged by its success at the high-school entrance examination, and compared with other schools, would stimulate teachers and taught to strain every nerve so as not to be beaten by their competitors.

In the absence of the Catholic high school there remains for most of our boys, who have finished the parochial-school curriculum, only the alternative either to take their chances in life with what they have acquired, or else go seek higher learning in the non-Catholic high school or other institution. We have already referred to the first feature of this alternative. It is a serious matter for the Church to leave large sections of her children in an educational condition where they may be exposed to blame their Faith for their secular disadvantages. The other alternative, namely, to have Catholic boys go without let or hindrance to the non-Catholic high schools is very objectionable. To our mind there is far less danger in allowing young children to attend the ward schools and young men to attend the non-Catholic technical schools and universities than in permitting the frequentation of the non-Catholic high schools or academies. We believe it would be better to frankly accept the public-school system as a whole and make special provisions for supplying its deficiencies in religious teaching than to expose our children to the influence of a dual system. The change of method and discipline, the sudden stoppage of all religious teaching must affect injuriously the parochial school-boy who enters a non-Catholic high school. Besides, he is just at that age which requires the most vigilant moral training; and he enters on the studies which specially need the direction of a religious teacher. It is a very serious matter to hurl the modest Catholic boy into the system known as the co-education of the

sexes; and it is a terrible ordeal for him to be introduced by unchristian teachers to the sensualities and heresies of English and other literatures, and to the lies and misrepresentations of bigoted histories.

When we consider the dreadful cost of a diluted faith and morals at which higher education has to be acquired by our youth in non-Catholic institutions, there ought to be no hesitation about making a supreme effort to supply them with the training they need, whilst safeguarding that which is the most precious of all possessions. The demand for such a supply is urgent, the means for giving it are within our reach.

The foundation and support of free Catholic high schools in every large centre is, then, the first and most pressing need of our secondary educational system. But, as we have already hinted, there is a still further need. We need a certain number of first-class colleges and technical schools exclusively devoted to the higher part of secondary education, doing for our young men what so many hundreds of similar institutions are doing for others. We want some colleges able to do for our people what Princeton, for instance, does for the Presbyterians; we want some colleges that can afford to confine themselves to the four years' course, to set a standard for entrance, a standard for progress, a standard for graduating. We have not one such at present in the whole United States. Our new university professes not to deal with such work, but rather with the still higher which is its proper sphere.

There are several of these four years' course colleges for non-Catholics in every State of the Union. Take, for instance, this State of Pennsylvania. Here there are more than a dozen such sectarian institutions, not counting the larger non-sectarian universities. We Catholics have not one. Yet we number about a million; that is about one-fifth of the whole population; and we are far more numerous than, and probably quite as wealthy as, several of the sects that own and conduct these higher colleges in the interests of their members. We seem to rest contented with seminary work, and the training of a mere fraction of the laity in our private, unendowed, agglomerate colleges. The result is, that whilst our clergy are, as a rule, well trained, our laity are far behind. We have not anything like the proportion we should have of educated laymen able to hold their own in the higher walks of life—in the professions, in business, in the applied sciences, in the arts, or in literature. Our disproportion in this respect is becoming more and more marked as time advances and educational methods progress. Our system of secondary education, if system it may be called, smacks too much of the monastery school with-

out the endowments of the monastery, of the *Petit Séminaire* with much of its *petitesse*, of the penal times when our laymen were debarred from knowledge.

Surely, there is no wisdom in continuing on those lines in these times and in this country. Yet continue on them we must, unless our pressing needs in this respect dawn upon those who have the power and the duty to come to the rescue. Every man who owns a dollar has this power, and every Catholic has this duty—the power and the duty of putting higher education within the reach of our people, in the only way in which it can be done, that is, by endowing directly or indirectly institutions of learning.

Here comes the question: How endow establishments of secondary education in the present state of things, seeing that they are nearly all in the hands of religious orders? To this it may be replied that no religious order could expect to receive endowments without giving satisfactory guarantees that they would be properly used; but, with such guarantees, there is no reason why a religious order would not be trusted as well as any other board of trustees. If, however, these guarantees (which should include power of inspection and of control) were not forthcoming, then let the endowments be made outside the religious order. Personally, we would like to see established amongst us what have made the greatness of other countries and peoples, and what are doing the same all around us here for non-Catholics, that is, some colleges endowed, organized and conducted, not in the interests of any particular order or section, but under the public eye and for the public good. The orders will know how to take care of the special interests confided by Divine Providence to their care. Some of them would, perhaps, be glad to be relieved of the burden which the education of outsiders puts upon them. The stronger ones would, probably, in presence of competition, concentrate a number of their present small collegiate departments in one or two real colleges. A few independent colleges would open once more to our laity the profession of teaching from which they are now practically excluded.

But, if the required direct endowments are beyond reach of Catholics at present, the same cannot be said of indirect ones, such as the foundation of prizes and scholarships in and the increased patronage of existing colleges. If Catholics are to remain beholden for secondary education to the self-sacrifice and zeal of the religious orders, the institutions which these are conducting should receive more encouragement.

Too often even the leaders of Israel seem quite indifferent as to what school or college will be frequented by the Catholic boy, once he has gone through the parochial school. And there is a

growing tendency among Catholics of means to send their sons to the fashionable non-Catholic seats of learning, even though they hear the most famous of them spoken of by those who should know as hot-beds of immorality. It is certain that if the Catholic brains and money that are now contributing to the support and fame of non-Catholic colleges were concentrated in our own, our position in this matter of secondary education would be far superior to what it is. The bodies that conduct our colleges could with proper encouragement afford to provide themselves with better equipment, better apparatus, better teachers, better programmes of studies, and thereby secure better results.

The importance of this question cannot be too strongly urged. Secondary education is the plateau on which the war of good and evil, light and darkness, will ever be decided. It is here that the strong and skilled forces, which are the mainstay of truth, are at the same time trained and brought into action. The result will influence the masses of young recruits on the plains below, as well as the select posts of observation on the mountain peaks above. It is from the plateau of secondary education that the proper stimulus can be given to the masses in the parochial schools ; it is from thence, too, that must be derived the select forces of the university.

Let us then see to it. Let us strengthen and equip our forces on this most important field of operation, so that the keen talents and high morality of our people may be extensively and efficiently utilized in the interests of light and strength.

JOHN T. MURPHY, C.S.Sp.

---

## THE EPISCOPATE OF BISHOP BARAGA.

**D**IRECT episcopal jurisdiction over the Upper Lake Missions of Michigan was established by Pius IX., July 29, 1853, by the creation of the Apostolic Vicariate of Upper Michigan.

Rev. Frederick Baraga was appointed Vicar Apostolic; he was at the time 56 years old, and for twenty-three years he had labored among the Ottawas and Chippewas.

He was consecrated Bishop of Amazonia, *in part.*, in the cathedral at Cincinnati, by Archbishop Purcell, in whose province the newly-created vicariate was, November 1, 1853. There were present at the solemn ceremony the Coadjutor Bishop of Detroit and the Bishop of Milwaukee, in whose respective sees the vicarial territory was situated. Bishop Spalding, of Louisville, was the orator.

In order to place under the jurisdiction of the venerable prelate the Indian missions which he had established and maintained on the littoral and islands of the Lower Peninsula, Bishop Lefevere, Administrator of the Diocese of Detroit, ceded his power to Bishop Baraga over the five counties in which these missions were located, namely, Antrim, Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Emmet and Leelenaw. Bishop Henni, of Milwaukee, ceded his power over La Pointe, and the group of the Apostle Islands, in the headwaters of Lake Superior, in the State of Wisconsin.<sup>1</sup>

It will be remembered that La Pointe had been the centre of missionary work during the first decade of Bishop Baraga's residence at the headwaters of Lake Superior, the crucial experience of which has been described in our article on the "Chippewas of Lake Superior."<sup>2</sup>

Bishop Baraga, thus honored by the Hierarchy of the American Church, and with the concurrence of the Holy See, obtained episcopal control over all the territory of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, over the littoral and islands of Lakes Huron and Michigan in the northern portions of the Lower Peninsula, and in that part of Wisconsin which had been the scene of his earliest missionary labors in the Lake Superior region. Most of the Indians residing in this extensive territory had been evangelized during the two preceding decades, and were leading Christian lives.

<sup>1</sup> These cessions were made in 1854.

<sup>2</sup> See the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW for April, 1896. Vol. xxi., No. 82, p. 354.

Leaving his missionary home at L'Anse, Bishop Baraga came to Sault Sainte Marie, and established there the cathedra of his apostolic vicariate.

Upon assuming the mitre, he is said to have exclaimed, "Now I can do something for my missions!"

He probably had in mind that as a bishop he could recruit and ordain priests; while he would personally receive the allocations annually made by the Propaganda of Lyons, France, and of the Leopoldine Society of Vienna, for the spread of the Gospel in this part of America, which allocations had previously generally been sent to the ordinaries of the dioceses in whose territory were located his respective missions, but from which he had derived but slight pecuniary aid. "Now I can do something!" There was much significance in this exclamation.

He who uttered it began his apostolic work when he landed at La Pointe, in 1835, with three dollars. After one year's experience among the unfortunate Chippewas on this island, during which year he suffered from the rigors of the climate and the paucity of food, he became so appalled at the prevalent misery that he went to Europe to procure financial aid wherewith he might be enabled to relieve their utter wretchedness.

By hard work and persistent effort, before the end of his first decade among the Chippewas on the island of La Pointe and subordinate missions, he had succeeded in improving their social condition. Divine Providence inspired him to move to L'Anse, and to establish there a colony of Chippewas who would cultivate the soil and provide a comfortable support for their families.

To purchase from the government the tract of land upon which the Chippewas were to make their new homes, to build the houses in which they were to live, and to furnish these houses to some extent, absorbed the last dollar realized from the capitalization of his patrimonial income; so that when he assumed the mitre of his apostolic vicariate it became a serious question with him, so denuded was he of material resources, where he was to procure the funds requisite to provide his episcopal outfit. Such was the status of Bishop Baraga when he was consecrated. From whatever source the money came to enable him to appear according to his episcopal rank is a question immaterial; it did come, and not in stinted measure.

Bishop Baraga had so well established his Indian missions that the priests to whom he confided their spiritual care had but little trouble in continuing his apostolic work. These missions, during all his subsequent episcopal experience, never caused him inquietude; while the welfare of those he had won from paganism—men, women, and children—was ever cherished. We shall see how his

paternal love for them was shown by his continuous visitations, while wearing the purple, to their villages and homes.

When Bishop Baraga came to Sault Saint Mary to inaugurate his apostolic vicariate, as stated, the old mission church of St. Mary was made his cathedral, while the adjoining old presbytery became his residence.<sup>1</sup>

At this time there were probably 2000 full-blood and half-breed Catholic Chippewas at the Sault and on the shores and islands of the river Saint Mary, who worshipped and who fulfilled their religious obligations in this old church. There were many sincere Christians among this population; for, no matter at what hour of the day you might enter St. Mary's, you would find many tawny-skinned devotees—men and women—kneeling before its altar.

Upon the advent of Bishop Baraga, St. Mary's of the Sault was in charge of John B. Menet and Auguste Kohler, fathers of the Society of Jesus, who had made old St. Mary's the centre of missionary work for the town, and for both sides of the river down to the lake.

They were holy priests, and they were so esteemed by the white residents of the Sault, and almost worshipped by the Indian and half-breed Christians. These Jesuits were members of a missionary band whose superior was Rev. Nicholas Point, S.J., pastor of the Church of the Assumption, at Sandwich, in Canada, on the south shore of the strait, opposite Detroit.

Father Point, at the time, had his missionary headquarters at Fort William, on the Canadian shore of Lake Superior. With him was Father du Ranquet, S.J. They had evangelized the Chippewas on that side of the lake, and occasionally, when asked, had visited some of Father Baraga's missions.

But the missionary work of the Jesuit Fathers, if continued on the American shores of the River St. Mary and at the Sault, would have to be subordinate to the vicar apostolic, while the Jesuits were subject directly to Father Point, who was controlled by the father superior at Quebec.

It resulted, as a consequence, that about three years later Fathers Menet and Kohler retired from St. Mary's and crossed the frontier line into the Canadian realm.

The career of the celebrated Superior of the Jesuit Missions in the Lake Superior region, which, at the time, had been revived, after the lapse of a century, but on the Canadian border of this wild region only, is so remarkable that we are tempted to give

---

<sup>1</sup> It is doubtful if there could have been found at the time, in any see in North America, such a poor example of a cathedral and such an episcopal residence as were St. Mary's and its presbytery, at the Sault, when Bishop Baraga assumed control.

a brief outline, in connection with the closing chapter of our sketch of the life and apostolic work of Bishop Baraga.

Rev. Nicholas Point, S.J., was born at Rocroi, Ardennes, France, April 7, 1802.

His classical education was partially completed in the college of St. Acheuil.

He was one of the few bright young men who, at the time, were blessed with a sacerdotal vocation.

He commenced his theological studies at Rheims, and received minor orders in 1825. On May 29th of that year took place the coronation of Charles X., last of the direct line of Bourbon kings of France.

On this occasion, memorable as an epoch in the history of French royalty, the Church honored the ceremony by the presence of her greatest dignitaries in the French hierarchy and with all the *éclat* of religious ceremonial.

Among the attending prelates was the Archbishop of Bordeaux, Elie Daviau du Bois de Sanzay, Peer of France and Knight of the Order of St. Louis.

How suggestive these details read, in the relation of the Church to the State at that epoch, when compared with the status of the Church in her relations with the French Republic of our own times!

In the archiepiscopal retinue of His Grace of Bordeaux was Rev. Nicholas Point, one of his deacons.

In the following year, May 20, 1826, Rev. Mr. Point was ordained to the priesthood at Rheims by Cardinal de Latil. Subsequently he was appointed vicar of the cathedral of Rheims, and then immovable rector of the parish of Vezzy and canon of the cathedral chapter. Thus at the age of 37 he had been honored with the highest rank attainable in the priesthood, and it was then that he entered the Society of Jesus in 1839. He was subsequently sent to Canada. In 1842 he succeeded the venerable Father McDonald, pastor of the Church of the Assumption, at Sandwich, Ontario, opposite Detroit. At the time this relic of the old regime of the Jesuits, which had been the Church of the Huron Mission of Detroit, founded by Father de La Richardie, S.J., in 1728, was still in use; it was a spacious old edifice, built of hewn timber, but rather shaky and kept in plumb by a row of solid beams around its exterior walls.

Father Point took up the work of his venerable secular predecessor and completed the present fine Church of the Assumption; the old relic of the previous century had, in the meantime, been taken down; a Jesuit missionary, Father de La Richardie, had built the first church of its name in 1728; his successor, Father Potier, S.J., last of the Huron missionaries, had enlarged the

original edifice in 1755—both fathers were of the “old regime;” and now, after 125 years, Father Point, of the “new regime” of the Society of Jesus in North America, completed the successor of the church founded by Father de La Richardie.

Besides building this church Father Point founded and built the College of the Assumption in the spacious grounds of the missionary domain. About twenty years ago the Basilian Fathers succeeded to the control of the parish, and have since successfully conducted the college.

The parochial work of this old parish was too monotonous for such a man as Father Point; for seventeen years he was, besides, superior of his order on the Western Canadian frontier. He and his associates sought for more active work in the missionary field extending from the shores and islands of the Georgian Bay up the River St. Mary and along the Canadian coast of Lake Superior to the head waters of this lake.

In 1854 Father Point's missionary headquarters was, as stated, at Fort William, on the Canadian shore of the great lake, with Father du Ranquet as his assistant.

In 1861 Father Point was appointed superior at Quebec, which position he occupied eleven years; having reached his seventieth year, he was transferred to St. Mary's College, Montreal, without special functions, where it was probably intended the few years remaining of his mortal existence might be agreeably passed in the cheerful society of the distinguished and venerable fathers domiciled in the college. But he survived most of those who greeted his coming.

Year after year passed and still the tall and venerable form of Father Point appeared in the halls and refectory of the college; he outlived three generations of the nineteenth century, and had become the dean of the sacerdotal order in North America, and probably in Christendom. He lived at St. Mary's twenty-four years, and was finally called to his eternal reward September 19, 1896.<sup>1</sup>

In the estimation of the North American Indian, Father Point was the perfect type of a “black gown;” he was finely formed, well preserved and over six feet in stature. No priest on the western lake frontier during the “fifties” was better known or more highly esteemed.

We do not believe that at the time the venerable prelates of the province of Cincinnati, who had advised the Holy See to create the Vicariate Apostolic of Upper Michigan, had positive knowledge of the hidden, undeveloped mineral riches of the Upper Pen-

<sup>1</sup> We are indebted to our esteemed correspondent, Rev. Arthur E. Jones, S.J., archivist of St. Mary's College, Montreal, for most of these details.

insula of Michigan, the disclosure of which was destined in the near future to attract capital from the older States for the working of the richest copper and iron mines in the world, and to attract from these States and from Europe the thousands of hard-handed toilers who were to be employed in penetrating the sterile soil and in forming the subterranean chambers in whose walls were masses of pure copper, or beneath which lay in the depths inexhaustible beds of rich iron ore.

Let us consider, for future reference, the religious fabric of the Vicariate Apostolic of Bishop Baraga as officially announced by him and of record in 1854:

Sault St. Mary; St. Mary's Church and Cathedral, Rt. Rev. Frederick Baraga, D.D.; Rev. John B. Menet, S.J.; Rev. Auguste Kohler, S.J.<sup>1</sup>

Mackinac Island; St. Anne's, Rev. Eugene Jahan.

Point St. Ignace (known in history as Michilimacinac); St. Ignatius, Rev. A. Piret.

La Croix; St. Anthony's, Rev. Ignatius Mrak, Rev. Lawrence Lautisher.

Beaver Island; St. Leopold's, attended by Father Mrak, from La Croix.<sup>2</sup>

Little Traverse Bay; St. Peter's, Rev. Angelus Van Paemel and Rev. John G. Steinhauser.

Middleville; St. Francis Xavier's, attended by Father Mrak, from La Croix.

Cheboygan; St. Mary's, attended by Father Van Paemel, from Little Traverse.

Duncanville; missionary station, attended by Father Jahan, from Mackinac Island.

Grand Traverse Bay; missionary station, attended by Father Van Paemel.

With the exception of Sault Ste. Marie, all these localities were in the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, on the littoral of the waters of Lakes Huron and Michigan.

Nearly all the priests serving these missions had been *protégés* of Bishop Lefevere, of Detroit. After he had ordained them they offered themselves for missionary work among the Indians on the northern shore of the Lower Peninsula. We have in mind the personality of two of these priests, Father Jahan, of Mackinac, and Father Van Paemel, of Little Traverse; holy men they were. Father Jahan was from France; he was short in stature, but he

<sup>1</sup> There were schools connected with all the Indian Missions. Those at the Saute were in charge of a lay Jesuit brother for boys, and the Ursuline Sisters from Quebec for girls.

<sup>2</sup> Father Mrak became the successor of Bishop Baraga.

was endowed with a frame of iron such as few men possess, and he accomplished much hard work. He endured the hardships of Indian missionary life for nearly three decades, and returned to France, where, in his native village, he might possess his soul, and in meditation and prayer await his call to eternity.

Father Van Paemel was one of two brothers, from the vicinity of the paternal home of Bishop Lefevere, in Belgium.

Of wealthy and pious parentage, the brothers, gifted with sacerdotal vocation, were among the young volunteers recruited by Bishop Lefevere for the diocese of Detroit. He ordained them, and they offered themselves for Indian missionary work.

Both brothers were tall and of splendid physique; they were cultured men, and pious by inheritance. The elder brother, Angelus, as has been stated, was a missionary at Little Traverse, one of the beautiful localities in the waters of Lake Michigan, near the northwestern border of the Lower Peninsula, a locality identified with the history of Catholic missions for nearly two centuries, when his mission, as has been stated, was included among those ceded by Bishop Lefevere to the control of Bishop Baraga. Father Angelus was subsequently given charge of the mission of La Pointe and its tributaries. On this island, for several years, he served, while he was idolized by the Chippewas; but the climate, whose rigor could not chill the delicate physique of Father Baraga, proved too severe for the stalwart Father Van Paemel. Broken in health, he returned to his native province.

His younger brother Edward was assigned to Indian missionary work among the Ottawas and Chippewas in the central counties of the Lower Peninsula, and subsequently to Muskegon, on the shore of Lake Michigan, one of the missionary localities visited by Bishop Baraga during his missionary career in the Grand River Valley in 1832.<sup>1</sup>

At the time we write, Muskegon is in the diocese of Grand Rapids, Michigan. Where sixty-two years ago there was an Ottawa village, there is now one of the prosperous cities of Michigan.

The primitive chapel and school, built of logs and bark for the Ottawas by the missionary Baraga, have long since disappeared, and have been replaced by three fine churches, with French, German and English-speaking congregations. Of the latter, St. Mary's, Father Van Paemel is pastor, assisted by Father O'Connor. Schools taught by the Ursulines are attached to these churches.

Above Sault St. Mary, on Lake Superior soil, the primitive

---

<sup>1</sup> See "Frederick Baraga Among the Ottawas," *AM. CATH. QUAR. REVIEW*, vol. xxi., No. 81, January, 1896, p. 106.

religious centres now included in the See of Marquette were, in 1854, described by Bishop Baraga as follows :

Eagle Harbor; Holy Redeemer Church, Rev. Louis Thiele, pastor, who visits the mining locations of the Keweenaw district, preaching and hearing confessions in the English, French and German languages.

Ontonagon Village, Ontonagon County; St. Patrick's, Rev. Lawrence Dunne, A.M., pastor. Sermons in French and English.

Visits from time to time the principal mining locations of Ontonagon district. There is an English Catholic school attached to this church conducted by Father Dunne's brother.

Our readers will, we hope, pardon us for directing their attention to the status of the religious provision intended for the service of the white population upon the assumption of the mitre by Bishop Baraga in November, 1853. There were two priests who had been supplied by Bishop Lefevere; one at Eagle Harbor and one at Ontonagon.

To complete the fabric of 1854 of the Apostolic Vicariate, there remained in the territory ceded by Bishop Henni in Wisconsin :

La Pointe; St. Joseph's, Rev. I. D. Carié, with subordinate missions.

Bishop Baraga, in speaking of La Pointe in his official report, states :

"This mission, indeed, has declined much in consequence of the government removal of the Chippewas of Lake Superior to the country west of the Mississippi."

Subsequently Bishop Baraga succeeded in securing, in the treaties negotiated by the United States Indian Agents, reservations for nearly all the Christian tribes located around the head-waters of Lake Superior, with annuities for most of these tribes, whose people he had evangelized, and they were thus enabled to retain their ancient homes, including La Pointe. Some of the Indians who had gone, with the others, to the West, returned and re-occupied their villages.<sup>1</sup>

It will be seen, therefore, that when the Apostolic Vicariate of Upper Michigan was established in 1853, its territory embraced twelve well-conducted Indian missionary-centres in the Lower and Upper Peninsulas, served by nine priests; while two centres of religious work at Eagle Harbor and Ontonagon respectively, with two priests, ministered to the faithful among the white population engaged at the time in the comparatively primitive development of the mineral wealth of the Lake Superior region.

Bishop Baraga officially reported in 1854, as under his control,

---

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed account of these treaties, see the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW* for January, 1897.

13 churches, 11 priests, 4 churches building, 8 schools, and a Catholic population of 5700 souls.

That same year he raised to the priesthood Rev. Louis H. Thiele, and soon after Revs. Martin Fox and Edward Jacker.

But the apostolic mitre of Bishop Baraga, so far as the spiritual care of the red-skinned Christians under his jurisdiction was concerned, was not painful to wear.

It was destined to become irksome by the phenomenal development of a white population, which came with rapidly-increasing numbers to the mining centres of the Upper Peninsula; among which, as has been stated, was a large percentage of people of the Catholic faith.

We have seen how, while this venerable missionary was absorbed in his devotional life and his philological studies at L'Anse, he did not hesitate, when his sacerdotal ministrations were solicited for some sick or dying Christian, to leave the sanctified locality of his humble missionary home, and to undertake, especially during the winter season, long and tiresome journeys, "often attended with great peril," as our friend, Hon. Peter White, has explained, to bring the last consolations of the Church to a Christian about to appear before his Eternal Judge. This was Christian charity exemplified heroically in one of the frailest and most delicately constituted, probably, of men.

Near, as we have before stated, and still claim and believe, that Bishop Baraga was to the divine presence, we are inclined to think it was revealed to him that the influx of white Christians upon Chippewa soil would be so great as to necessitate a change in the general system of his missionary work. We repeat the words contained in a letter to his sister:

"It appears strange to me," he wrote, "to be among a congregation of white people." "I live here in peace, and am much more comfortable than among my Indians; but I feel like a fish thrown on dry land."

Whatever may have been his misgiving as he gradually realized the impending change, he was not dismayed. Rev. Edward Jacker, whom he had ordained in 1855, was destined to become an able co-worker; and as a man, a confidential friend, who would aid him materially in carrying the burden of his episcopacy.

But money, and above all priests, had to be obtained to provide for the spiritual requirements of his new constituents.

To obtain both he went to Europe.

He visited Vienna, where he was kindly received by the imperial family and presented at court.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "Bishop Baraga had more than one audience with the Pope, at whose hands he received rich gifts. He represented the American episcopate at the marriage of the Emperor of Austria."—Dr. Shea, 4, p. 591, who quotes from *Detroit Catholic Vindicator*, August 5, 1855.

He next visited his native province, and received an ovation which consoled him for many privations. In the Austrian capital he was made the recipient of princely aid in money, while in the old Catholic province in which was his family-seat he recruited several valuable priests. He visited Paris in the interest of his mission, and then went to Dublin, to obtain Irish priests for his new congregations in the mining-centres of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

The results of his European visits were encouraging; he secured five priests and considerable funds, and he returned to Sault Ste. Marie in 1855. In Bishop Baraga's report for that year, we find the Jesuit fathers still at the Sault, while their Superior Father Point was at Fort Williams. Father Jahan at Mackinac Island had established the Society of St. Vincent de Paul and other pious works. At the other Indian missions there had been no change, generally, except that Father Jacker had been located at L'Anse, whence he made regular visits to the Portage mining district, where he established stations and preached at stated times in English, French and German, and heard the confessions of the faithful speaking these languages. Not only did he perform this work, but he attended sick calls nearly as faithfully in all that region as Bishop Baraga had done during the decade of his missionary life at L'Anse; and this is saying much in favor of Father Jacker.

Father Angelus Van Paemel had commenced his apostolic work at La Pointe, having been transferred from Little Traverse, on Lake Michigan, where he was succeeded by Father Steinhäuser.

Religious progress among the cosmopolitan Catholic populations of the mining centres is notable by the work of Father Jacker referred to, and by the addition of another priest, Rev. Martin Fox, who was sent to the assistance of Rev. Laurence Dunne at Ontonagon. These were all the changes which had been made in the copper-mining region. The iron-mines had, in the meantime, been developed sufficiently to prove their unparalleled richness by the abundance and quality of their ore. Bishop Baraga fully realized that Marquette would become the centre of iron-mining development, as Ontonagon, the Keweenaw district, and Eagle Harbor were in reality the centres of copper-mining.

He accordingly sent to Marquette, after his return from Europe, Rev. Sebastian Duroc, one of the French priests he had obtained while abroad, to establish a church at the central port of the iron-mines.

Saint Peter's was built and dedicated by Father Duroc. This was the initial church in the future cathedral city of the diocese of Marquette.

At the close of the year 1855 Bishop Baraga reported 16 churches, 14 missionary stations, 5 churches building, 16 priests, 11 schools, 1 young ladies' academy, and a Catholic population of 6000. It is probable, if such a statement had been considered at the time as having reference to a diocese located in any of the older States of the Union, it would be concluded a Catholic population of 6000 was well provided for.

But spread such a population over the extensive range of forests and waters from the northern counties of the Lower Peninsula, over all the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, and beyond the shores of the latter, among the islands in the head-waters of Lake Superior—a country including a vast extent of coast-line not generally understood—and take into consideration the bloods and races of the peoples composing this population, and an indefinite estimate might be formed of the responsibility delegated to Bishop Baraga by the hierarchy when he was invested with the mitre of the Apostolic Vicariate of Upper Michigan by Archbishop Purcell, at Cincinnati, in 1853.

In 1857 the Apostolic Vicariate was replaced by the Diocese of Sault St. Mary, and Bishop Baraga was confirmed by the Holy See first bishop, in accordance with the petition of the Fathers of the First Council of Cincinnati.

The following year, 1858, he ordained, at Little Traverse, Rev. Nicholas Louis Sifferath and Rev. Seraphin Zorn.

Contemporary with Bishop Baraga in the American hierarchy during the "fifties" were 6 archbishops and 50 bishops.

This was exclusive of mitred abbots.

Dr. Shea, in his last volume of "Church History,"<sup>1</sup> gives 46 portraits, including those of all the archbishops and 40 of the bishops. This valuable collection offers an interesting study to the intelligent student of the history of the Catholic Church in the United States during her formative period, or, rather, during the progress of her great expansion.

Considering the nationality of the hierarchy at the period referred to, we find 13 were "to the manor born," of whom several were of Irish parentage; 16 were born in France, among whom were most of the distinguished missionary bishops among the Indians and the pioneer settlers of the Western States, whose worn features and whitened hair indicate most decidedly, by premature age, the nature and hardships of their apostolic work; 21 were born in Ireland, and among this number may be found some of the most distinguished of the prelates of the Church in modern times, as well as of her saintly rulers, while her theologians and

<sup>1</sup> *History of the Catholic Church in the United States, 1844 to 1866*, pp. 727. Royal octavo. New York, 1892.

writers are to a large extent represented; 2 were born in Germany; 1 in Austria—Baraga, of Sault St. Mary; 1 in Belgium—Lefevere, of Detroit; and 1 in Switzerland—Henni, of Milwaukee.

Several of the prelates whose portraits are given were members of the Society of Jesus. Whether it is a fancy on our part or not, it is certain we recognize the Jesuit type in Carrell, of Covington;<sup>1</sup> Miège, of the Indian Territory,<sup>2</sup> but more especially in the excellent likeness of Van De Velde, of Chicago.<sup>3</sup>

Nearly all of the 46 portraits are those of men who had passed the meridian of life, while a few faces among the younger prelates are finely formed and, to some extent, youthful in appearance.

After a careful study of all the portraits of the distinguished Fathers of the Church in Dr. Shea's collection,<sup>4</sup> it will be admitted, we believe, Bishop Baraga's is the most remarkable. It will be found on page 588 in Dr. Shea's history, referred to above.

Who can look upon that face, feminine and handsome as it is, and molded in such winning lines, whose beauty is but slightly shaded by the intellectual and by the determined cast which give expression to that youthful-looking face, to that finely-formed brow, to that shapely head covered with abundant, flowing auburn hair, and not exclaim: "Is this the portrait of the saintly missionary Baraga?"

Yes, this is the portrait of Bishop Baraga! Scion of an ancient lineage, from the genial climate of far-distant Carniola, near the Adriatic, who, while yet young in sacerdotal years, crossed the seas and came to Detroit, a quarter of a century previously, to devote his life to missionary work among the Pagan Indians of the Lower and Upper Peninsulas of Michigan, whose apostolic career we have attempted to outline; whose life among the wretched Chippewas, whose toilsome journeys through the Lake Superior forests in midwinter, while the temperature was many degrees below zero, forests without roads or habitations, where a night's sleep was to be had in a deserted wigwam or in a great snowdrift; who tramped on the frozen surface of the bays of the Great Lake, or who sailed upon its treacherous waters in his frail boat with a single attendant, to bring the last consolations of religion to some dying Christian—as if it were in the power of any mortal to describe travail whose severity is known only by the Almighty Ruler whose will it was that His devoted servant should accomplish such work!<sup>5</sup>

But there is another consideration, reserved more particularly for the limited number of Americans who, versed in American In-

<sup>1</sup> P. 574.

<sup>2</sup> P. 264.

<sup>3</sup> P. 235.

<sup>4</sup> In Shea, 4.

<sup>5</sup> The original portrait was painted after the return of Bishop Baraga from Europe in 1855.

dian bibliography, can appreciate the valuable contributions of Baraga to Algonquian bibliography, in the Ottawa and Chippewa works which he composed and had published. Such scientists, when they study the picture with all its freshness and beauty, may well exclaim: Can this be the portrait of the missionary Baraga who, while toiling in missionary life, found the time to write his Chippewa grammar and to compile his dictionary of the Chippewa language, works which have made his name immortal in Indian bibliography?

The Very Rev. Edward Jacker, who became more and more intimate with Bishop Baraga, and finally his personal attendant, states that throughout all his sacerdotal and episcopal career he was an early riser; it was his custom to rise at three o'clock in the summer and at four in the winter. Meditation and prayer occupied the two first hours of each day. This confirms our remarks upon the high estimate he placed on the value of time made in a former article.

Describing this early morning devotion, Father Jacker writes:<sup>1</sup>

"You would invariably find him on his knees, wrapped in his cloak in sweet communion with his Creator, no matter what difficulties the circumstances of time or place might seem to offer.

"I have seen him thus devoting to God the first hours of his day's work or journey; in the depths of the Lake Superior forest; on the shore of the lake in a howling storm; in some sequestered corner of a crowded, uncomfortable boarding-house, as well as in his own simple room in his residence at Sault St. Mary."

"When, after some long and tiresome journey," continues Father Jacker, "by land or by water, we had reached our place of rest, often an hour or two after midnight, when 'balmy sleep' was essential to the recuperation of mind as well as of physique, one would naturally conclude Bishop Baraga would forego his customary early devotion and take the rest apparently requisite to sustain him in his missionary work. But there was no deviation on his part from his rule of life on such occasions; after I had been refreshed by several hours of sound sleep, and arose to make my own morning devotions, I found the bishop on his knees absorbed in meditation and prayer." Bishop Baraga led a saintly life; each day his life was devotional.

Whether at his humble home or while upon his most toilsome journeys, no food passed his lips until noon; this was his invariable rule.<sup>2</sup> His food at all times was simple; but while pursuing

<sup>1</sup> We are indebted to Professor J. F. Edwards, of the faculty of the University of Notre Dame, for a manuscript copy of Father Jacker's eulogy on Bishop Baraga, which the professor kindly had taken for us from the printed copy in the *Catholic Archives of America* at Notre Dame.

<sup>2</sup> During the last twenty years of his life Bishop Baraga abstained entirely from the use of meat.

the solitary tramps he was accustomed to make through the forests of the Upper Peninsula, he subsisted on crackers and cheese, a limited supply of which he carried in a pocket of his coat. As has been stated in our former articles, he never used stimulants.

That the literary status of Bishop Baraga was of a high order is unquestionable. His collegiate career, considering the times and circumstances ensuing after the Napoleonic wars, was exceptionally brilliant; while the works he wrote remain, and always will, a high tribute to his ability as a scholar and an author, more especially so in his bibliographical contributions to the languages of the indigenous races whose ancestry were formerly rulers of the Lower and Upper Peninsulas of Michigan, among whom he made his home, to redeem the people of these races from Paganism and to bring them within the fold of Christianity, for their spiritual and temporal regeneration.

Aside from the saintly attributes of Bishop Baraga, Father Jacker tells us "what manner of man" he was:

"Although by no means," he writes, "a stranger to those exquisite sensations which the new, the beautiful and the sublime awakened in the mind, his inclination tended toward the comforts of home and the quiet enjoyment of study and literary work in preference to the excitement and uncertain movements inseparable from missionary work among the red or the white races. He would naturally have preferred the society of the refined and literary people of the European circles to the association in daily life with the rude and vulgar elements constituting the degrees of uncivilized, semi-civilized and civilized communities for whose peoples he had left home and country and crossed the seas to labor for the salvation of their souls."

He came to Michigan to devote his life to the evangelization of the Indians of her Upper Lake regions. In this he succeeded.

Not so much perhaps by self-sacrificing labor as by the divine concurrence induced by his holy life.

As to "what manner of man" he was, in what constitutes the principles of charity, Father Jacker states: "He endeavored to become everything to all in order to gain all for Christ. He was the especial friend of the poor, of the miserable, of the ignorant, and particularly of the children of these. He tenderly loved them in the Sacred Heart of Jesus, whose divine personality, in his eyes, they represented."

There is probably no doubt the magnetic influence of the soul of such a sincere and holy Christian man as was that of Frederick Baraga attracted to him the love and veneration of those of the unfortunate Chippewas, among whom he lived and suffered, during the mature years of his sacerdotal life.

Speaking of the Indian missionary vocation which led Father Baraga to the wild and frigid regions of Northern Michigan, Father Jacker writes: "That during the seven years of his work as a parish priest in his native province, 'Gospod Frederick,' as he was called by the Sclavonian people of his extensive parish, was distinguished for his zealous and charitable work among the poorer and more ignorant of his flock."

We do not assert as a fact, but we incline to the belief, that it was intimated to Father Jacker by Bishop Baraga that, while thus engaged in parochial and charitable work in his native parish, "Gospod Frederick" reflected that there were many able and willing members of the sacred ministry who would care for the spiritual and perhaps for the temporal interests of the unfortunates of Europe, while across the seas in North America there were uncounted thousands still poorer, living in the darkness of paganism, whose souls might be won to God, but for whose salvation very few had the courage to offer themselves for the sacrificial ordeal of such missionary work.

Why should he not go there, where the labors, the privations and the hardships incidental to such missionary work would be acceptable to God, and become the means of his own spiritual perfection, which he so ardently desired? Such reflections inspired the vocation of a missionary life among the Indians of Michigan.

Father Jacker writes: "This vocation was inspired by the will of God, and He whose inspiration created the vocation enabled the postulant to accomplish its work."

We have outlined his missionary work among the Ottawas and Chippewas, and we firmly believe his sensitive nature and sincerity of purpose was, to a great extent, satisfied with the results of his self-sacrificing labor. While the responsibilities of a missionary among the Ottawas and Chippewas were, to such a man, conscientiously fulfilled, but, as we have endeavored to show, at the cost of much personal hardships, the burden of episcopal responsibility which involved the spiritual care of a constituency including Indians and whites became heavy.

While rewarding such a saintly, such an indefatigable Indian missionary with the mitre, the American hierarchy placed upon his head, all unaware of the fact as they may have been, an ever-reminding crown, which concealed within its silken exterior more thorns than honors.

During the winter seasons, sometimes lasting more than six months, the Upper Peninsula was closed to the missionary work of Bishop Baraga. But the Indian missionary stations on the River St. Mary, on the shores of the northern portion of the Lower

Peninsula, and on the islands in the adjacent waters, were regularly visited by Bishop Baraga, who made these visitations in mid-winter, travelling at times alone on the ice on snow-shoes.

In the winter of 1859 he completed the preparatory instruction of two postulants for the priesthood: Patrick Bernard Murray, whom we subsequently knew, and Gerard Terhorst. Both of these students he ordained in the spring of 1860.

With the opening of navigation the bishop usually commenced his episcopal visitations to the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. His account of one of these apostolic journeys is characteristic and suggestive :

"On the first of May, 1860," writes Bishop Baraga, "I embarked on a steamer at Sault Ste. Marie, bound for Lake Superior ports. The first day we got along all right. On the second day, however, we met immense fields of floating ice, extending on all sides as far as eye could see; the steamer could proceed no farther, and lay to for twenty hours, when the wind drove the ice ahead and opened a channel.

"The first mission I visited was the mining centre of Portage Lake, or Houghton, where we have a good-sized church, which, however, is already inadequate to accommodate the faithful who assemble there on Sundays and festivals. The copper-mines in this district are very productive, and the Catholic population numbers 4000 adults—American, German, French and Irish—comprising nearly half the mining population. Rev. Edward Jacker is the resident priest, who preaches in the English, French and German languages, and who hears the confessions of the faithful of these three nationalities.

"While at Portage Lake I authorized Father Jacker to build a new church large enough to accommodate the fast increasing Catholic population of the district.

"My next missionary visit was to the young city of Superior, at the extreme head-waters of Lake Superior.

"The people there were exceedingly glad to see me, the servant of God, at the time; for the pious and zealous missionary, Father Van Paemel, who had attended Superior from La Pointe, could not stand the rigor of the climate, and had become so feeble that he was incapacitated for the performance of missionary work, and, taking the last steamer from La Pointe the previous season, he had returned to his native country, Belgium, in the hope of recuperating his health. He has written me he is very anxious to return to the scene of his missionary labor, but he fears he will not be able, as his health will not permit.

"The people of his missionary circuit were affectionately attached to him, and greatly saddened at his departure.

"They felt keenly the absence of a priest during the long winter. The sudden departure of Father Van Paemel so late in the season prevented me from providing a priest to take his place.

"I remained ten days at Superior, and performed, as I had in former years, the duties of a missionary priest.

"Often I spent the entire day in the confessional.<sup>1</sup> I instructed the adults and children; baptizing, blessing the marriages of the natives and regulating their Christian life as far as it was possible. From Superior I went to La Pointe, eighty miles east.

"This was the scene of my first mission in the Lake Superior region, which I had established twenty-five years previously.

"I remained there ten days doing missionary work, such as I had performed during my younger years. I felt so happy to be in my natural element, for such it was to me. I baptized sixty-four persons at La Pointe and Superior.

"I was glad to hear that only a few deaths had occurred during the absence of a missionary priest. I wish to state that, while our Christian Indian population increases slowly but regularly, the wild, unconverted Indians decrease in number more and more each year, and there are comparatively few full-blood Pagans remaining in this locality.

"On June 10th, while at La Pointe, I baptized twenty-three persons, and preached in the Chippewa language twice in the morning and three times in the afternoon. My work being concluded in this vicinity, I went to the mining town of Minnesota, where Rev. Martin Fox is resident pastor. He has the largest and finest church in the diocese, but it is already too small for his parishioners, who are of French, German and Irish nationalities. Fortunately, his church has three large doors. While one-half of the faithful are seated inside, the other half stand outside on Sundays, and through these doors they can see the priest and assist in the divine service.

"Last winter there were two priests at Minnesota, Revs. Father Fox and John Cébul, the latter from my native province, Laibach, in Austria, whom I had sent to Minnesota after his arrival, to learn English and French. Father Cébul readily acquired a practical knowledge of these two languages, and during the last three months he has preached to the English and French congregations on Sundays at stated hours, and he hears confessions in the respective languages.<sup>2</sup>

"I have sent Father Cébul to La Pointe, from which place he

<sup>1</sup> This means that the apostolic Bishop Baraga confessed the whites in English, French and German, and the Chippewas in their native dialect.

<sup>2</sup> This venerable priest, dean of Ontonagon, in the diocese of Marquette, after thirty-six years of missionary work, still labors in the vineyard of our Lord.

will attend Superior and other missionary stations. As he is so highly endowed with the faculty of acquiring the knowledge of languages, I hope he will soon be able to preach in the Chippewa dialect. After my visit to these missionary centres I was obliged to return to Sault St. Marie, where a great number of letters had in the meantime arrived which required immediate attention. When I have given attention to my accumulated correspondence I will undertake a missionary tour to the southern part of my extensive but thinly inhabited half-Indian diocese."<sup>1</sup>

In the meantime Bishop Baraga, during the long and dreary winter seasons, continued his literary labors in the dingy little room of his "episcopal residence," at Sault Ste. Marie. After his consecration and prior to his departure for Europe, he had printed by Joseph A. Hemann, Cincinnati, "Eternal Truths Always to be Remembered by a Catholic Christian," a work of 337 pages, in the Chippewa language, and after his return from abroad, by the same publisher, in 1858, a revised edition of his Ottawa prayer-book, a most valuable work of 237 pages.<sup>2</sup>

The official statement of Bishop Baraga at the close of the year 1860 indicated the continuous increase of his white constituents.

The population of Sault St. Mary had changed to a great extent from full-blood and half-breed Indians to whites; the former were still there, but they no longer predominated.

Of the Indian missionary churches and stations, there were nine in the Upper Peninsula and adjacent parts of Wisconsin in the head-waters of Lake Superior, and six in the Lower Peninsula.

The Sault, as has been stated, Mackinac and Duncanville, were no longer Indian missions; their population had, to a great extent, changed from the red to the white races. But in the mining centres the increase of the white Catholic population had been progressively large. There were churches at the Cliff Mine, at Copper Harbor, at Keweenaw Point, Marquette, Minnesota Mine, Nebraska Mine, Norwich Mine, at Ontonagon and at Portage Lake. Bishop Baraga's interesting account of his visit to these mining centres has been given above.

At each of them he was confronted with an overflowing congregation wherever a church had been provided with a pastor. To such a sensitive nature as was that of the bishop, this state of affairs could not but weigh upon his mind, and render the mitre of his episcopal charge at the time a burden more difficult to support than had been the heavy pack which he had carried upon his shoulders, while travelling as a missionary, as we have attempted

---

<sup>1</sup> For the English version of this letter, the original being in German, we are indebted to Rev. C. Verwyst, O.S.F.

<sup>2</sup> Described in this REVIEW for January, 1897.

to describe, in the lonely and frigid journeys he had made in these same localities.

At this time the Very Reverend Ignatius Mrak was vicar general of the diocese, while stationed at Eagletown as an Indian missionary.

Including Father Mrak, there were six priests attending Indian missions, among whom were Father Jacker, and at La Croix, in Emmet county, Rev. John Bernard Weikamp, of the third order of St. Francis; while from L'Anse, where Father Jacker was stationed, as has been stated, sick calls in the Keweenaw district were attended. The priests caring for the spiritual interests of white Catholics in the diocese of Sault St. Mary included Fathers Thiele, Duroc and Fox, with Jacker, both white and red, as were also Murray and Mrak, white and red; while the spiritual leader of these devoted servants of God was "all things," as Father Jacker has said, in order to gain their souls—to the Christians of the white races, to the sallow-hued half-breeds and to the copper-colored natives of the soil. This was thirty-seven years ago.

He who impartially studies the make-up and the status of all the episcopal sees in the United States east of the Mississippi at this period in the history of the American Church cannot but admit that in the diocese of Sault Ste. Marie, extending from the vicinity of the Straits of Mackinac to the borders of Wisconsin on the headwaters of Lake Superior, having a coast-line of nearly 700 miles, the venerable bishop, his vicar, and the ten priests serving in this extensive diocese, accomplished more spiritual work than could be laid to the credit of the bishop and priests of any contemporary diocese. We may be mistaken.

But we have studied the situation existing at the time carefully and seriously. As an humble citizen of Michigan, we do not hesitate to submit the record of Bishop Baraga, nor do we fear adverse criticism on our conclusions.

But the erudite prelate of Sault Ste. Marie had in the meantime not been unmindful of the intellectual accompaniments of Catholic missionary work in his diocese. He had thirteen free schools for boys, and an equal number for girls, which were maintained in connection with twenty existing churches and nine missionary stations. At this time Bishop Baraga estimated the Catholic population of his diocese, including the whites, the half-breeds, and the Christian converts among the Indians, at 10,600.

The two Jesuit fathers had been recalled from Sault Ste. Marie, on the American side. The parochial work of the Catholic Church devolved upon and was performed by Bishop Baraga.

It is probable the bishop responded to sick calls on the American and Canadian sides of the River St. Mary, from the rapids

down to its mouth. This, in winter, necessitated snow-shoe journeys on the ice and along the shore.

The bishop's assistant at this time was a French ecclesiastical student, Honoratus Bourion, whom he ordained to the priesthood in 1861.

The charitable soul of Bishop Baraga, who for a quarter of a century had been toiling for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the Chippewas of Lake Superior, and for whose benefit he had expended all the money he had realized from the capitalization of his patrimonial income, was greatly consoled by the results of his beneficent efforts, in the evident improvement in the social condition of the Christian people of this unfortunate race.

Wherever the climate had permitted, they had planted and raised corn, which was a great essential, a healthy and nourishing element in the domestic economy of an Indian's household.

Not only had the Christian Chippewa cast aside the cult of his ancestors in their contempt for manual labor, and in condemning their wives to toil for the support of their families, but he had learned to respect the mother of his children, and to take upon himself the burden of their support.

Instead of shivering by the fire of his cabin in midwinter and smoking his pipe, while his thinly-clad wife and naked children, half-starved as they were, huddled around him, the head and the paternal support of the humble household, he had, by Christian influence, learned to realize his responsibility under the eye of his Creator. Laying aside his pipe, and protecting himself against the cold in the best manner his poor wardrobe permitted, he had gone out upon the ice in a zero temperature, cut holes in its surface, and with his spear secured an abundance of the fish which a merciful God had placed at his disposal, and which provided an ample supply of healthful and nourishing food for his household. Although many of the noble animals of the chase had disappeared, there remained still in the forest several varieties of smaller wild animals, whose fur was valuable, while the beaver continued to build his home and to multiply his species in the streams undisturbed by human intrusion. These vestiges of the chase of former generations the Christian Chippewa industriously exploited.

In the early spring he tapped the maple-tree, and made as much sugar as his primitive methods permitted.<sup>1</sup>

These special results of Bishop Baraga's missionary work, which, by the mercy of Divine Providence, he was permitted to witness during his lifetime, in the ameliorated status of the Christian Chip-

---

<sup>1</sup> These facts were communicated to us by Mr. Francis Jacker, of Jacobville, on Lake Superior, by letter dated February 5, 1897. Mr. Jacker is a younger brother of Father Jacker. He is a ripe scholar, and has a Chippewa wife.

pewa, were important. That they were consoling to the charitable heart of the venerable missionary there is every reason to believe. But the average reader of the REVIEW, who may become interested in this outline of the career of one of the most saintly men who had trod the soil of Michigan's northern wilds and the shores of her great lakes, may not fully appreciate their significance.

The American Indian *pur sang* is a nomad *par excellence*. You will find many of his type in the regions west of the Mississippi. He lives in an atmosphere of wild excitement in the hunting-fields, while his squaw, his children and his cabin are but incidental concomitants to his existence. He does not work as civilized people do, and he is an utter stranger to the economical requirements of a civilized life. Circumstances such as fell to the lot of the "Indians of the Indians," of the Iroquoian nations of the Country of the Lakes of New York, may deprive him of his hunting-field, and civilization may prevent the more exciting indulgence of his propensity for war. In war and in the chase, the Indian *pur sang* lives in his natural element. In the course of events the American Indian has first been cut off from following the war-path, and then his hunting-fields have been taken from him and given up to the white settler for cultivation. Left upon his native soil with circumscribed territory, his nomadic habits render him unfit for agricultural life, whose laborious requirements are repugnant to his nature. It has required the greater part of this century to transform the once warlike Senecas, who still occupy their ancestral homes in Western New York, from the nomads and the warriors they were before the time of Red Jacket to the tolerably fair farmers they now are. The nomadic life is a part of the nature of the American Indian. Its fascination is probably not understood by the average American citizen living in civilized communities.

We sometimes wonder why some of our friends, even in mature life, will leave their luxurious homes, put on the hunter's outfit, make long journeys through the woods and spend weeks in camp life, to hunt and fish, and thus enjoy the excitements of the chase.

In cities there are often men engaged in important business affairs who make the sacrifice of valuable time, and who undergo the fatigue incidental to such expeditions, for the purpose of enjoying a mere taste of the excitements, if not the sweets, of a hunter's life.

If such considerations can induce the citizen to leave home and fireside at stated times each year, and to seek the solitude of the wild forest to become, for the time, an amateur nomad, there must

be great attractions to compensate for the contribution of time and the endurance of the hardships experienced in the pursuit of such enjoyment.

The triumph, therefore, of Bishop Baraga in weaning the wild Chippewas from a nomadic to a semi-civilized life, being understood, will be more generally appreciated. He had not only converted one generation of wild Chippewas from Paganism to Christianity, but with the practice of Christian life came the improvement of home, with the habits of industry. The scenes of semi-starvation and of misery which met his eyes when he first came among the tribes, and which appalled his soul, had disappeared from among the Christian communities he had redeemed from barbarism.

In 1862 Bishop Baraga ordained to the priesthood, at Rockland, Rev. Francis R. Flannigan, and the same year, at Sault St. Mary, Rev. James Sweeny.

"In order to attend a council of his brother bishops at Cincinnati," writes Very Rev. Edward Jacker, "the venerable prelate traveled a distance of over 150 miles, partly on snow-shoes and partly in an open sleigh in midwinter, while the weather was exceedingly severe. He arrived at Thunder Bay, on the western shore of Lake Huron, quite sick and almost frozen. From the hardships endured during this journey he never entirely recovered."

In 1865 he ordained to the priesthood, at Hancock, Revs. Edward Walsh, William Dwyer and Patrick Gallagher. It will be noticed that as early as 1862 he held one ordination at Rockland, while the three last mentioned were at Hancock, both places being in the copper-mining centres.

October 15, 1865, the see of Marquette was created jointly with that of Sault St. Mary, and Bishop Baraga, after a residence of twelve years at the Sault, transferred his cathedra and residence to Marquette.

With this change, the jurisdiction which had been ceded by Bishop Lefevere over five counties in the Lower Peninsula, the Apostle Islands and adjacent missionary points in the head-waters of Lake Superior in the State of Wisconsin, which at the same time had been ceded by Bishop Henni, reverted back to these prelates. While the Christian Indian population had been lessened by the reversions mentioned, the white population in the diocese of Marquette had more than doubled, aggregating 22,000. As stated, a church had been built at Marquette, and churches at Clifton, Eagle Harbor, Escanaba, Hancock, Houghton, Maple Grove, Rockland, Negaunee, Norwich Mine and Wyoming, and stations had been established in sixteen mining towns. There was, however, a great want of priests, the churches and stations being

served by only fourteen priests. The Ursulines had a convent and school at Marquette, and the Sisters of St. Joseph had similar establishments at Hancock, L'Anse, and at Sault St. Mary, where Rev. A. Baudin, S.J., was pastor of St. Mary's Church.

The first and the only ordination at Marquette was in 1866, when Rev. John Vertin, its present bishop, was raised to the priesthood by Bishop Baraga.<sup>1</sup>

Dating from the time of that fearful journey on the ice and snow, when he arrived at Thunder Bay, half-frozen and ill, commences the physical decline of Bishop Baraga. From the effects of this exposure he never recovered, writes Father Jacker. For four years he continued to fail. In 1866, symptoms of palsy, a hereditary disease in his family, became manifest; his right hand became partly paralyzed.

In September, 1866, he made his last entry in the journal he had kept for many years.

He preached for the last time, in St. Anne's Church at Hancock, three different sermons in the French, English and German languages; but he found on this occasion that his voice was failing.

Very Rev. Father Jacker states that prior to these events the burden of his episcopal office, with its cares, disappointments and responsibilities, was harder to endure than the toil incidental to his missionary life during former years. This burden, he asserts, tended to weaken the vitality of his naturally strong constitution, and to bring his career to a premature end.

From another source we are assured that during his episcopal administration "he drank sorrow at every breath." While, as a missionary, his life had been made happy by consolations, as a bishop, solicitude, anxiety, scruples, disappointments and deceptions marred the peaceful course of his holy life.<sup>2</sup> Bishop Baraga built at Marquette the Cathedral of St. Peter, the finest church at the time in the Upper Peninsula. He attended in October, 1866, the Plenary Council of Baltimore, and was the guest of the Archbishop.

While a procession of prelates was forming at the archiepiscopal residence, Bishop Baraga was stricken down with an apoplectic stroke; in falling, his episcopal cross fell between his head and the pavement, inflicting a deep wound from which blood flowed freely, thereby saving his life. Subsequently, when he returned to Marquette, he heard confessions, attended sick calls, and performed other sacerdotal duties when necessary.

---

<sup>1</sup> We are indebted to Rt. Rev. Dr. John Vertin, Bishop of Marquette, for the names of the priests ordained by Bishop Baraga, and the years in which the ordinations occurred.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. Walter Elliott, C.S.P., Manuscript.

Soon, however, he became so feeble he was forced to remain in his room, assisting at the Holy Sacrifice, however, on Sundays and festivals in the cathedral.

Aware that his final hour was near at hand, he continued to meditate and pray. Conscious to the last, and after receiving the Holy Sacrament, the gentle, the chivalric and the charitable soul of Frederick Baraga quietly passed to eternity on the morning of January 19, 1868, Feast of the Holy Name of Jesus.

Bishop Baraga died in his seventy first year; forty years of his life had been spent among the Indians and whites in Northern Michigan.<sup>1</sup>

Never, since the death of the Irish Mohawk chief and British baronet, Sir William Johnson, at his castle on the Mohawk, while a council of the Iroquoian sachems was in session, in 1773, have the souls of the American Indians been so deeply moved by the death of a white man as were those of the Chippewas and Ottawas of the upper lakes of Michigan, when Bishop Baraga died.

Sir William had won the confidence and esteem of the rulers and people of the tribes of the Six Nations of New York.<sup>2</sup>

Swift runners were sent to every canton of the Confederacy from the Mohawk to the shores of Lake Erie, with the sad tidings of his sudden demise; thousands came to follow his remains, with sorrowful hearts, to the tomb. But Bishop Baraga had been revered and loved as a saint. The telegraph flashed the news of his death to all connecting points; and although it was in mid-winter, the Indians, stricken with grief, came on the ice and snow to Marquette in great numbers to look for the last time on the lifeless form of their beloved apostle.

To enable the people of the most distant tribes to reach Marquette in time for the funeral, the body of the bishop was kept for nine days; it did not freeze and it remained pliable. On the day of the funeral all business in Marquette was suspended; even the railroad shops were closed. All, Protestants and Catholics, knew his life, and that he was a man of God.

The Indians were permitted to act as chief mourners when the body of Bishop Baraga was finally entombed in the cathedral.<sup>3</sup>

"Thus ended the career of a man," writes Father Jacker,

---

<sup>1</sup> The Indians and half-breeds of the Upper Lakes were firmly convinced of the miraculous powers of Bishop Baraga. Many instances have been mentioned in corroboration of this belief. When the half-century succeeding his death shall have elapsed, the "cause" of his sanctification may be undertaken by a succeeding bishop.

<sup>2</sup> The baronet had been made a Mohawk war-chief; his second wife was Molly Brant, a sister of Joseph Brant—Ta-yan-da-ne-ga, renowned in American Indian history—by whom he had eight children.

<sup>3</sup> Every article of the wardrobe of the dead bishop was cut into small pieces and distributed as relics, by Father Jacker, to the Indians and half-breeds.

"whose purity of soul, whose singleness of purpose, whose mortified life, and whose burning zeal, joined to uncommon talents and acquirements, faithfully and successfully employed all in the service of Almighty God among the most abandoned of his creatures.

"His memory will be honored in the history of religion and of civilization in the State of Michigan, and particularly in the Lake Superior country, where he lived during the greater part of his life."

In closing this outline of the life and services to God and in the cause of humanity, of Bishop Baraga, we are inclined to refer to what we wrote in our opening article, "Frederick Baraga Among the Ottawas," published in this REVIEW for January, 1896. We called attention to the changed condition of religion in the Grand River Valley of Michigan.

Where Father Baraga had built his chapel of logs and bark, in which he had preached and baptized the aboriginal owners of the soil, there is now the cathedral church of Grand Rapids and four other churches.

The Ottawas have gone; but white civilization has effected a wonderful transformation in this, one of the fairest regions in the Peninsular State.

From the pen of a fair and talented lady of Marquette we are permitted to describe the religious status of this diocese as it exists thirty years after Bishop Baraga's accession:

"There are now caring for the spiritual interests of the faithful in the Upper Peninsula, 55 secular and 8 regular priests. There are 54 churches with resident pastors; 24 mission churches; 17 chapels of religious orders; 64 missionary stations; 19 communities of religious women; 5 academies for young ladies; 20 parochial schools, with 6000 pupils; 3 orphan asylums; 4 hospitals; 2 industrial schools for Indian youth, while the total Catholic population is estimated at 80,000."<sup>1</sup>

Our readers may draw their own conclusions from the facts we have stated.

We have attempted to outline the work of the holy missionary in the Lake Superior region; we have attempted to describe his journeys through the solitary forests in such frigid seasons that the wild animals instinctively remained within the protection of their lairs and dens, while the frail form of Frederick Baraga, burdened as it was, alone broke the silence of the dismal scene, as his snow-shoes pattered on the icy surface or over the snow-drifts, in which he sometimes made his bed.

What wonder, then, that the soil of the upper peninsula of

---

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. George Barnes, in *Women's Edition of the Iron Ore*, Ishpeming, January 16, 1897.

Michigan, which had been trodden by the footsteps of such a saintly man, should have produced such an abundance of regenerating spiritual fruit!

That by the will of Divine Providence this fruit was not destined for the nourishment of the Chippewa race, but for the white races who succeeded on Chippewa soil, probably may have been among the disappointments mentioned by Father Elliott, which Bishop Baraga experienced during his episcopal term.

In all North America no such example may be found as is now shown in the changed condition of the wild and barren region of the Lake Superior country since the time when Father Baraga began his apostolic work among the Chippewas, which includes the last five decades of the expiring century.

This lake region is, and always will be, ice-bound during the winter season. But it is now covered with flourishing cities and traversed by railways, whose systems connect with the commercial centres in North America, between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

During these decades the richest copper- and iron-mines in the world have been developed. One of the former, the Calumet and Hecla, has been equipped with gigantic machinery forged in the works of the Krupps, in Essen, Germany, exceeding in magnitude any wrought-iron work ever known in modern times. In 1855 the Lake Superior Ship Canal was built, through whose locks the largest steamers afloat may pass in and out of the waters of Lake Superior by way of the River Saint Mary, at the Sault. This canal, with its locks, is a monument to engineering science. Under the supervision of the late Gen. O. M. Poe, U. S. A., it was enlarged. Its massive gates surpass in extent any similar work in the world.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In 1896 the canals at Sault Saint Mary were opened April 21st, and closed December 8th. The custom-house registers show there passed to and from Lake Superior:

Sailing vessels, . . . . .	4,391
Steamers, . . . . .	13,404
Freight barges, . . . . .	820
Total passages in and out, . . . . .	18,615
Aggregate registered tonnage, . . . . .	17,249,418
Number of passengers carried, . . . . .	37,066

While during 8 months in 1896, 18,615 steam and sail vessels, whose aggregate tonnage exceeded 17 millions, passed through the Lake Superior Ship Canal; during all the year 1896 there passed through the Suez Canal 3434 vessels, having a total of 8,448,383 tons, representing the commerce of the commercial world.

Freight destined for Lake Superior ports:

Net tons of coal, . . . . .	3,023,340
Barrels of salt, . . . . .	237,515
Unclassified freight, net tons, . . . . .	520,851

What the Erie Canal was in its day in importance as a factor in the development of interstate commerce between the East and the West, the Lake Superior Ship Canal is proportionally a greater factor in the universal commerce of America and Europe.

The contrast between the old system and the new is suggestive; in the former the motive-power of the old-time canal-boat was a team of horses or mules on a tow-path; in the latter the finest vessels afloat are moved by steam—object-lessons of both epochs.

Cereal products from the West destined for Eastern ports and tide-water:

Wheat, bushels, . . . . .	63,256,463
Flour, barrels, . . . . .	8,882,858
Corn and other grain, bushels, . . . . .	27,448,071

Mineral products of the Upper Peninsula:

Manufactured and pig-iron, net tons, . . . . .	121,872
Iron ore, net tons, . . . . .	7,909,250
Copper, net tons, . . . . .	116,872
Silver ore and bullion, net tons, . . . . .	280

The canals were open during the season of 1896 231 days. In the traffic up and down there were:

Freight barges, . . . . .	110
Fast passenger steamers, . . . . .	10
Freight steamers, . . . . .	875
Sailing vessels, . . . . .	390

The numbers are probably understated. The tonnage value of this marine property may approximate:

For sailing vessels, . . . . .	\$ 195,500
Fast passenger steamers, . . . . .	5,000,000
Freight steamers, . . . . .	21,875,000
Barges towed by steamers, . . . . .	55,000
Capital invested in marine, . . . . .	\$27,125,500

Approximate gross earnings:

From freights, . . . . .	\$10,000,000
“ passengers, . . . . .	556,000
Total gross earnings, . . . . .	\$10,556,000
Movements of shipping capital and gross earnings, . . . . .	\$37,681,500

There is, however, no uncertainty about the figures given below of the values of the products passing through the canals during the season of 1896. Sault Saint Mary is a port of entry, and the U. S. customs rules require attested statements of values of products moving in and out.

Value of flour, . . . . .	\$33,500,000
“ wheat, . . . . .	31,000,000
“ other grain, . . . . .	4,100,000
“ unclassified freight, . . . . .	30,000,000
“ coal, . . . . .	7,000,000
“ manufactured iron, . . . . .	3,500,000
“ pig-iron, . . . . .	350,000

For strategic more than for commercial considerations, the Government of Canada has completed a ship-canal on the Canadian side of the Sault; so that from both sides of the wild cataract on whose American shore the Jesuit Fathers Jogues and Raymbault had planted the cross on Michigan soil in 1642, and where, 200 years later, Bishop Baraga spent twelve years of his episcopate, the children of the Chippewas may gaze in wonder at the gates fashioned by the hands of white men, and which are moved by steam, and which control the waters of Lake Superior.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

---

Value of iron ore, . . . . .	21,000,000
“ silver ore and bullion, . . . . .	10,000
“ lumber, . . . . .	8,000,000
“ building stone, . . . . .	240,000
“ salt, . . . . .	200,000
“ copper, . . . . .	23,000,000
<hr/>	
Total value of freights moved, . . . . .	\$161,900,000
Add commercial marine, . . . . .	27,125,500
Gross earnings, . . . . .	10,556,000
<hr/>	
Total, . . . . .	\$199,581,500

---

Aggregate capital represented in one season's operation and traffic through the Lake Superior Ship-Canals at Sault Saint Mary.

During the decade ending December, 1896, there passed through the American Canal at the Sault over 100,000,000 registered tons of steam and sailing vessels; 52,600,000 barrels of flour; 340,000,000 bushels of wheat; 50,000,000 bushels of corn and other grain. From the mines there were shipped: 850,000 net tons of pig and manufactured iron; 48,000,000 tons of iron ore; 700,000 tons of ingot copper. And from the forests: 4,700,000,000 B. M. feet of lumber.

In addition, there were coal, salt, silver, and 4,200,000 net tons of unclassified freight. For these statistics we are indebted, first, to Hon. Peter White, Marquette; to George A. Newit, Esq., Commissioner of Mining Statistics; and Charles S. Osborn, Esq., Sault St. Mary.

## CATHOLIC SPAIN—ITS POLITICS AND LIBERALISM.

THERE has been a menace in the air recently of diplomatic troubles between Spain and the United States. The circumstances of Spanish rule in Cuba had excited humanitarian sentiments to a becoming degree of agitation; and perhaps some prospects, which flattered a covetous sense, appealed to feelings rather of self-interest than of humanity. Prompt intervention was demanded. The great American Union was to recognize the insurgents, liberate the island; and what half a dozen great European powers are now doing in the little port of the little island of Crete, in the Mediterranean, the republican power of the American continent was to have done around the rich island of Cuba, in the Gulf of Mexico. But while the European ships are now thundering about Crete in the interest of Turkey, more careful reflection seems thus far to have hindered the Federal authorities from doing around Cuba against the interests of Spain.

The merits of the diplomatic question need not concern us here. As to the public opinion, which has been exploited so much, we may give due credit to the enlightened public, either for knowing what it is about, or at least for following instincts which are sufficiently true in their trend and ultimate direction. The instincts, indeed, which have sprung forward to affront Catholic Spain seem to have been much truer than any principle or policy that could be invoked for justifying our interference between that mother country and her American colony.

Is it not, for instance, a first principle and a settled policy with the free citizens of the republic to live and let live, and scrupulously to mind one's own business? Is it not also a principle, raised to the dignity of being called a doctrine, that in the whole of the new world, throughout the length and breadth of America, north and south, no foreign power shall ever interfere with the established order of things; and Europe is not to disturb, by ever so slight a movement, the balance and poise of affairs which belong to America?

It is in view of such a policy, so clearly and repeatedly stated by responsible authorities of the United States, that we may explain the state of exasperation with which high-minded Spaniards have regarded the behavior of Americans in the Cuban question. They may be excused for inferring, from such a well-known American doctrine, that people who profess it and propound it should act upon it, and keep their hands off affairs which

do not belong to them, nor make difficult and impracticable the political relations of a mother country with her colony.

The policy, then, in the Cuban agitation would seem to be at fault. But the instincts which threatened to override the policy appeared to be quite true. And the feelings of Spaniards were not soothed by suspecting the real motives of the inconsistency. A desire to tear away the last shred of her American possessions from Spain, because Spain is always and everywhere identified with Catholicity, would seem to be a motive not at all foreign to that public, which could sympathize so noisily with the tearing away of educational rights from the Catholics of Manitoba, which has always applauded the tearing away of the temporal power from the Pope, which could never see any cause for resentment when a Captain Lugard was perpetrating his atrocities upon the Catholic missions in Uganda, and which, in fine, could never discover at any time a reason for humanitarian distress if Roman Catholics were the victims; while the sources of compassion are demonstratively inexhaustible and the acuteness of humanitarian vision is miraculously indefectible in spying out and describing and weeping over every evil of the known world, in Armenia or in Crete, in Dahomy or in Siam—anywhere, in short, if only Roman Catholics are not in question.

We do not say that this is a correct view of the issues involved in the Cuban trouble. But as we wish to look at Spanish affairs from a Spanish side, we must be true to our subject and look at them also under Spanish colors.

## I.

To present the picture, then, under Spanish colors, the first tint we must apply is this: That the people of a free republic appear to stand forth under such a light of intolerance and meddlesomeness as to excite odium by the very mention of their name. It has been advisable that a stranger in Spain should be introduced not as American. Strangers might be presented to people in the peninsula as English, French, German, as anything; but the name American should be suppressed. This seemed to us like a complete upsetting of all traditions which are thought to be associated with the free citizens of a great republic. Young people, at all events, are led to believe in the United States that, while with them, as with the republicans of old Rome, the name of a monarchy, of a king or queen, may well arouse their just sentiments of aversion, yea of horror, they may take it for granted that the mere thought and mention of their own liberty and enlightenment, that the aroma which is diffused around their own toleration and broad-mindedness, will command at once a tribute of respect all the

world over, and, if anywhere, certainly among the humble subjects of a monarchy. Recently it has not been thus in Spain, which is very strictly a monarchy; and an American could perceive there that, to his own sense likewise, the fragrance of the republic was not overpoweringly sweet—that is to say, in Spain.

The next trait in the picture is this, that, if we speak of the Spanish people at large, we must not imagine them to regard the Cuban question, or the Cuban war, with any sentiments of self-congratulation, or even of the commonest satisfaction. The Liberal Government, which is responsible for the actual course of events and for all that went before, is no object of gratified contemplation to the people at large. They consider that Cuba has been badly governed; that the Liberal proconsuls, sent out by the Liberal Government, have been doing what such proconsuls have always been noted for, as far back as the time of Tiberius and beyond; that they have simply been sucking the life-blood out of the country, and gorging themselves, while the golden opportunity smiled. It seems to them that if the propensities and appetites of the dominant liberalism have been so uncontrollable at home, what range of credence might not be allowed to the capacities and exploits of those appetites abroad? And, if it is found written in the record of nineteenth-century liberalism, as showing its prowess in the peninsula itself and quite within the memory of man, that it has robbed and appropriated, and murdered and massacred, and displayed other such plumage of its native amenities from the time of Queen Christina to quite a recent date, well it need not be thought incredible that, in the warm climate of Cuba, it should have exhibited some of its warmest tropical colors, and perhaps with a wantonness of luxury. Finally, it is altogether in keeping with this, and with the rest of a Liberal Government's history, that the interested parties who ply the political trade, having filled their pockets and glutted their appetites, should make the hapless nation pay for the limitless consequences of incompetency, duplicity, dishonesty and treachery.

But it is a bold line that is traced in the picture by the foreign element of interference on the part of the United States. Let family quarrels be. They should be kept in the family. The havoc they may occasion is not a charter for strangers to interpose. Besides this plain dictate of common decency, there were other circumstances which, to the minds of the chivalrous Spanish nation, made the interference of Americans particularly odious—as well the active co-operation of citizens with the insurgents, as the menace of diplomatic intervention on the part of the Government. It would appear that the Spaniards never did consider the Cuban difficulty as one of serious importance in itself. So we

have heard it affirmed. It was merely a question of time to smooth away the causes of complaint on the side of the colony ; just a little more wisdom in the home government, a little more liberality and a good deal less of liberalism, with some other such provisions, and affairs should have righted themselves. And, even if there were nothing short of bloodshed which could introduce wisdom into the heads of such a Government, still it was not Cuba itself that ever caused apprehension in the mother country. The ground of fear lay outside of the island—in the big republic adjoining. And further, it is said, a certain stand of dignified firmness in face of the Federal authorities had, on a former occasion, dispelled the cloud which was gathering in that quarter. Was the dominant liberalism so wanting in every quality that it could not even muster up a trifle of national dignity and speak to an intrusive neighbor in a manner becoming a nation?

People believe that there was never more reason to fear the loss of Cuba than there was to entertain fears about the Philippines. Yet the Philippine war has been summarily dealt with ; and the distinguished general who has conducted that war has lent the weight of his authority to the just criticism regarding the United States. Declining to accept a commission to Cuba, he has given it privately, as a reason for his refusal, that he looked upon the case as hopeless ; that, while in the Philippines there were the British interests in India to second Spain, it was quite otherwise in Cuba, where the sympathies, if not the interests, of the United States were steadily operating against Spain. And, in such case, the spirit of insurrection becomes too deeply rooted, and the distance of the colony from home is too great, for effective measures of repression and pacification.

One further circumstance occurs to mention in explanation of the Spanish attitude towards the Cuban question. It will serve to complete the picture from the side of the Spanish people. It is the belief in an undercurrent of Freemason duplicity and perfidy, which, while pretending to administer the affairs of State and direct the operations against the insurgents, has been all the time fostering the game, replenishing the pockets of individuals with the commercial profits of the transactions involved, and, above all, practising the most sacred fidelity to the principles of Freemason sectarianism. This fidelity to Freemason principles means simply an unlimited traffic in every other principle of honor and fidelity, both to duty and country, if only a point can be won against religion. A colony, however valuable to a mother country, has a right to be cut adrift and sent to seek its fortune under another sky of progress and civilization, if thereby its religion, its morality and ecclesiastical condition can be brought under control ; which can-

not be done to any degree of satisfaction as long as the colony is bound over to a country altogether too Catholic, as long as it is hampered by constitutional guarantees in favor of Catholic principles and Catholic life, and can never be enfranchised from Catholicity until it is also delivered from Spain.

Duplicity of this kind puts no bar to the profession of patriotism, enlightenment, progress, on the part of such liberal-minded politicians. The example of Italy and France, along with Spain, is eloquent in showing that the most noisy patriotism consists in putting anti-religious perfidy first, individual and private plunder second, and respect for the country, or regard for its flag, in quite a subordinate place. The noisier the shouts of patriots, and the more violent the flaunting of the flag, the more reason there is to suspect some double game going on all the while.

There seems to be no doubt whatever, according to Spanish conviction, that Cuban insurgents and Philippine revolutionists have been under the control and leadership of Freemason sectaries. It has been understood, likewise, that military operations have been shackled, and the war prolonged, owing to manœuvres going on at headquarters in Madrid. The only point which would seem to admit of elucidation on this head is to determine the proportion of the parties in collusion, how many of these leaders, purveyors, guides and counsellors are distributed about the seat of war, and how many are about the chambers in the Spanish capital.

## II.

These few traits of the picture, representing the Spanish side of the Cuban question, portray to the life another feature of Spanish affairs, altogether irrespective of the trouble in the colony. It is the strange confusion of interests which embroils the political condition of Spain. There is on one side a Catholic people intensely Catholic, the vast body of the nation. There is on the other side a political nucleus, making a show of constitutional government, and apparently conducting the nation on constitutional lines. Besides, there is a Catholic family, which seems to be a devout one, in quiet possession of the throne. Now, these three elements do not agree. Their tempers are somewhat incompatible.

Their respective attitudes towards anything like business may be described as active, passive and neuter. What we should expect to be the most active element of all is that which is neuter—the great body of the nation, the good Catholics, who only put up with the Government, who dislike it, distrust it, and, in the light of their own faith and practice, despise the Government, and all who belong to it. This dislike for the governing policy seems to fall back, in no small degree, on the reigning family, which found

its claims to reign seriously contested by Catholics in the Carlist civil war. The issue of the war, which left the ardent Catholic adherents of Don Carlos defeated and routed, could not but draw closer the bonds of union between the Alphonsist dynasty, thus consolidated on the throne, and the dominant liberalism which had employed the national arms to support it. And now the throne and liberalism may well be considered identified in all their bearings.

In face of such a government, the nation at large is a neuter, unsympathetic factor of political life. There are reasons, too, of a more general significance, which explain the same phenomenon in other countries besides Spain, and which we had occasion to refer to recently when treating in this REVIEW of political liberties in Italy.<sup>1</sup> We will mention distinctly here only such as we heard expressly assigned by competent authority in Madrid: First, political elections are a mere name; they are a system of open corruption, and good Catholics take no interest in the disreputable business; secondly, public life and government in the country is only a system of robbery and the gathering in of spoils. To these two reasons we cannot forbear adding another, which was so conspicuous in the case of Italy, that any method of government which is foisted upon a people without regard to its tastes, tendencies and natural manner of development, becomes inevitably a system of oppression devised by the craft of some association, and instead of being a government by the people and for the people, as constitutions profess to be, it is an administration by a sect and for a sect, and at the expense of the people. Not that Spain is averse to representative forms of government. Before the British Parliament sat, Spaniards were administering their own affairs in popular assemblies. But such assemblies were the outcome of popular initiative, and were supported by popular energy—a description which certain modern constitutions do not answer at all. The result is neutrality, except in one respect, that the people are bound to pay the bills, not only financial, but also those which are contracted at the expense of national morality, intelligence and good sense. The wise governors do it all, and the nation, which, in other respects, is extremely neutral, becomes here lamentably passive and extraordinarily patient.

The really passive element seems to be the monarchy, or rather the reigning family. It is Catholic and devout in its ways and customs. Its traditional obligations, in the exhibition of faith, devotion and charity, are simply delightful. They are the expression of Catholicity, conceived by a long line of Catholic monarchs,

<sup>1</sup> AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1896: "Italy and the Ruins of Political Liberty."

and gladly and cordially perpetuated by successive generations of devout kings and queens, whose instincts of faith have been little less than sublime. It would refresh our eyes, ears and hearts to be witnesses of some small portion of all that wealth of Christian devotion, which the reigning house in Spain expends personally and regularly on the divine service, and also in the service of kindness, condescension and charity.

But, when there is question of bridling the liberal policy of ministers, or else letting things go their way on the path of modern progress and religious indifferentism, all that we need say about the reigning family is this: The other branch, which was considered more loyal, that house of Don Carlos, for which so many fought and bled in the mountains of Biscay, is pronounced by thoughtful people to be just as bad, on the score of liberalism, as the Alphonso branch which maintained its possession of the throne. From this we infer that both sections of the family have found themselves equally helpless in the face of an aggressive liberalism, and to save themselves, perhaps to save the monarchy at all for the nation, they have pared down their principles to terms of negotiation with the sect which bestrides the nation. And thus the throne becomes a passive element in the government.

The active element is not hard to describe. A word suffices, and every one feels competent to fill up the rest of the description for himself. It consists of the politicians, who manage the show of elections, who buy and sell, walk into power, change hands and walk out, are more or less decorous in sight of the public, but for the rest govern the public from behind screens, in halls or lodges apart. The wings of opposing parties are both of them conservative. The Spaniards must have a monarchy, just as they will be Catholic. The radical party, or republicans, take a hand in affairs when they get a chance, and then they shoot and kill at large, especially religious and priests. When their heyday passes they hide in their holes again. And Castellar beguiles his weary time of leisure by writing wisdom for American reviews, till some brief spell of sunshine shall break again, as this Cuban trouble seemed happily to prognosticate, and then the republicans would have been free once more for their work on the priests and nuns.

But really we consider it a hopeless task to try to understand any genuine Spanish question unless we first take the measure of that article which is called Liberalism in Spain. To our dull sense this is a very intangible matter. We wonder whether even an Italian or a Frenchman finds it easy to grasp the idea of Liberalism in the peninsula. It means at bottom a disorder in the conception of what has always formed the dearest, strongest power with the Spanish nation—its faith, its religion, its God. It is a

wrenching of the moral and political organism which alters the attitude of individuals and of the nation towards purity of worship, wholesomeness of education, towards spotlessness of morality and honor, both public and private. It is a blank in the national portrait, a gloom over the picture, where there should be the bright sunray of religion to light up the features, and quite a heaven of the supernatural to set off the landscape. The Spanish nation become liberalistic is no longer the Catholic Spain of history. We might as well think of Ireland, under the colors of Protestantism or of religious indifferentism—and what a notion we should have of the fair Catholic isle!—as dream of Spain reposing finally and contentedly in the arms of Liberalism.

Hence the question arises, What is this Liberalism? To answer this question we must first take a look at the physiognomy of the people.

### III.

Around the frieze of the *Lonja*, the famous public hall of Saragossa, which was once the capital of the ancient kingdom of Aragon, we read a long and elegant inscription, which begins with the words: "In the year of the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, 1551," and closes with the prayer: "May God hold this lodge and this city in the palm of His hand, that justice, peace and good government may ever be fulfilled herein." This appeal to God in prayer, this profession of faith in the reality of God's supernatural providence, has been as much a vibrating instinct in the public life of the Spanish people as it is in the daily thoughts and aspirations of their spotless domestic life. At the feet of Our Lady, in her magnificent basilica of the pillar, you may see the throng of men and women and children prostrate on the pavement, a stream of devotion ever passing before her there, and people in Saragossa could not think of retiring to rest at night if they had not paid their duty of affection to her during the day. In the churches of every city, at almost any hour till noon, you may find the faithful hearing Masses at one altar or another, just as in the numberless churches of Rome, but in a style and manner of devotion which Spain may claim as altogether her own. It is not supported by benches nor reclining over chairs that they pay the tribute of their personal worship to the God of the Holy Eucharist. The men, wrapped in their ever-graceful cloaks, the women, with none of the vagaries of the hat or the bonnet to crown them, but in their simple veils, are prostrate on the pavement of stone, concrete, marble or mosaic; and there without support, erect, without change of attitude, except when they rise for the Gospel, they exhibit the noble spectacle of Christian prayer or meditation. As in the life of religious communities, the church, the chapel and the altar are the

centre, the hearth and the meaning of their existence; so with the Spanish family, municipality, army and royalty, the services of divine worship and of personal devotion seem to be still, as in the ages of faith, the origin, the centre and the term of all other movements. Whoever is familiar in literature with the Catholic life of the ages of faith, will have no difficulty in realizing what atmosphere he is breathing in, when the simplicity and naturalness of this piety diffuse their warmth about him. The obstructions and constructions devised by modern comfort are wanting. The splendor and magnificence of God's temples are overwhelming. And, in its simple richness, the fountain of supernatural piety is ever flowing and springing up, and circulating in its limpid streams through all the garden of a Christian life. It is not strange that the verdure should be fresh and the violets blow.

Here we are in midwinter. Rain, rain, nothing but rain! The great palace of the Escorial, enclosing its monastic cloister, is wrapped in a floating gauze of mist, which divides as the rain relaxes and closes as the rain thickens over the stupendous pile. Mountain torrents are wild on the bleak highlands, and in the distance silver streaks of foaming water line every slope of the wooded hills. We wonder, when royalty placed its palace here and brought religious contemplation to share the halls, did it conceive of earth as a footstool of God, and the throne as a stepping-stone to heaven?

A tantalizing streak of bright sky, away in the direction where the Atlantic ought to be, opens to the imagination the lashing of the sea in all its fury there, and one shivers again with new associations in the bleak, bleak waste. The clouds break over our heads, the rain suspends, and with the sunshine comes a whistling and a roaring of the wind. And it snows. Ice under our feet, snowflakes playing around, the sunshine fleeting like a vision, and the tumbling waters heard rushing in all directions. Goodness, what is life up here? And we are told that religious never use a fire in these parts; that, in Avila there, which is lying on the slope of its lofty plateau, and is thronged with monasteries and convents, as in the days of St. Teresa, no one in the cloister knows aught of those obvious comforts, without which a newer Christianity would be like to die, forthwith and forever. How characteristic of the ascetic Christianity of our forefathers! And princes and great monarchs seem to have been largely imbued with it, and lived in such discomfort, proud in the consciousness of their Christian manhood, as simple folks could not tolerate now under the new dispensation.

It was a rainy evening in the streets of Madrid, and it was already dark. We had taken refuge like others in a street-car. All at once there was a commotion among the passengers; they rose,

turned, and looked in one direction. The car stopped—such an occurrence as would suggest to an American mind the idea of an accident. But the men had taken off their hats; a bell was ringing, a little, tinkling bell; lights were passing by, the lights of torch-bearers. It was the Blessed Sacrament, carried to the sick by a priest. He himself was conveyed through the rain in a carriage.

If royalty met the priest with the Blessed Sacrament, the king or queen would descend, and, resigning the carriage to him, would bear him company on foot to the bedside of the sick person. If he passed by soldiers' quarters, the trumpet would sound, the guard salute, and two soldiers file out under arms as an escort, and after the ministration return with him to his parish church. On the feast of Corpus Christi it is the general army regulation that the regiments line the streets, and, as the celebrating priest reaches the colors of each detachment, the standard-bearer throws the flag upon the ground before the celebrant, who then, standing upon the colors, turns and blesses the regiment with the Sacred Host, and passes on to do the same to the next regiment in the same form.

But we must not be led off into the charming incidents of Catholic faith and devotion with which Spanish life is full. We are merely selecting some incidents, to fix the imagination, for the purpose of understanding what such a people would mean by liberalism. We omit, then, the many signs and scenes of Christian hospitality and dignified cordiality which will meet the eyes anywhere; the many indications of filial reverence and affection, not chilled into a freezing reserve, because the son meets his father in public, and is garbed in the dashing uniform of a cavalry cadet. If it is a result of their isolation from the bustle and hurry of the modern world that the people of the peninsula live still amid the fragrance of all those family and Christian virtues which belong to ages of faith and were thought to be dead long ago, it is, indeed, a happy isolation, and is really the franchise of universal friendship, where one is more at home with all his compatriots in a great nation than modern life would allow him to be with his neighbors in the same street or in the same square. There is no reason for timidity; none why any person should stand off. The coldness, the implied rebuff before you venture to approach or before you venture to speak: Touch me not! Speak not to me! the positive hostilities ever permanent, and created by the mere presence of sectarianism, of infidelity and of paganism all about you—all these improvements of civil life, quite peculiar to our advanced civilization, will be found wanting there, where neither cultured paganism exists nor infidelity would ever think of opening its mouth; where, if a chance sectarian minister wends his erring

way, he shrieks back in agony to his own country, as the spirit in the Gospel cried out in despair when he came near to Christ.

Every one here is a Catholic. Freemasons cannot afford to die without the Sacraments. It may have done well enough to elude the obligations of conscience and faith while making merry during life, but it will not do at all to run risks after death. No one dies unshriven and impenitent; no one sleeps the drunken, polite sleep of drugs and narcotics, or goes into eternity like a dog—gently, peacefully off, charmingly intoxicated. The glorification after death, with the exposition of the hero's relics, the flowers and the wreaths, and all the other civilized lies of an advanced state of social decomposition, seem to be lacking as yet in the charmingly simple, true and Christian realities of a people living still in the full sunlight of supernatural faith. And, if we admit that conformity to such a standard of religious propriety may be sometimes, or even often, prompted by human respect, and by the desire to stand well in public opinion, yet we must also admit that great is the power of faith in a nation of our days, when to stand well with the world one must even be a hypocrite and stand as a good Catholic!

The modern world, too, exists in Spain; and we may as well take one short peep at it, before we leave these scenes, and come to our thesis about Liberalism.

There is a spot, 3600 feet high, in the centre of the old kingdom of Catalonia, whence a couple of the other old kingdoms of the peninsula may be viewed as with the glance of a bird's eye. It is the great mass of conglomerate called the mountain of Montserrat, rising abruptly from the banks of the river, which has just passed through Manresa, which winds round this mole, and flows down to the Mediterranean by Barcelona. This is the mountain famous for its sanctuary of the Blessed Virgin and its monastery, ensconced in a crevice of the rocks, half-way up the hill. From the top of its peaks one views the range of snow-clad Pyrenees, where at their highest level they divide Upper Aragon from the valley of the Garonne, and we fancied we could trace them in their course far away to the west, to where they shielded also the valley of the Gave, with Lourdes and its sanctuary nestling at their feet. Eastward and southward the shining Mediterranean runs away into the silvery clouds that trim the horizon. To the west, Aragon reaches down southward to the old kingdom of Valencia. And Catalonia itself goes rolling away from all its boundaries, with its undulating hills and valleys, to the long line of seashore, with Barcelona set like an historic gem in the centre. It is there that one may find the world of which we wish to speak.

But, before going down to that lower world, it is worth while just to breathe a moment the air of this upper world. From this high

point, the hills beneath, which allow the rivers to pass between them and wash their feet, sink into little ripples of land, like the traces which receding waves leave of their presence on the sands of the shore. The rivers themselves have sunk to the dimensions of streaks, as if they, too, had been left behind, and were dribbling away to overtake the retiring tide. Everything is so distinct in the wintry sunshine that the net-work of hills over the country and kingdom around, raised only as relieving terraces on the surface of the land, suggests the tracery of a fine lace imprinted on the vine-covered soil. While the good monastic brother shows us from lofty pinnacles the kingdoms of old Spain, he shows us with much greater effusion something of the glories of the Virgin of Montserrat; something of the happiness which is the portion of her service; how he himself had voyaged over seas, in years gone by—he was still a young man, under fifty—and how he had been in many harbors, and had even seen the great port of New York; but at last he had found a port to his liking, and there was no berth on land or sea like the cradle of devotion at Montserrat.

We had reason to look upon this as something like manly devotion. Here he was serving two strangers. During five hours and a half did he wander around peaks and over them, down through gorges and up the face of precipices; and all that morning no morsel had passed his lips; nor could anything induce him to dispense with his monastic fast. Nor was it Lent; it was before Twelfth Night, in the merry time of Christmas. And he was quite joyous. Pointing to a hill, which looked like a stone's throw off, beyond and beneath the monastery, he recounted with complacency how it was there, under the shadow of Montserrat, that the invading French had met with their first reverse.

Here was indeed a world to live in—one which, to be brief and precise, we might simply call a Spanish world. In other days it was common all over Christendom. Now, when Christendom is reduced to almost the confines of Spain, it is distinctly Spanish. Away on a mountain, with devotion and stillness for your daily food, with fast and contemplation, and a heart lighter than any pilgrims brought, or even carried away with them! A monastery, and a sanctuary, where in the cold winter no ray of a warm fire greeted your senses, and where the passage you traversed by the monks' choir, or the window you looked through in your room, was a perforation in a wall eight feet thick! Under the smile of the Virgin of Montserrat, the little surpliced choristers came forward in the stillness of the evening to join in the closing chants of the monks' office; and their lights seemed scarce to pierce the darkness, as their voices thrilled through the vaults of the basilica; and one lived out of the modern world, yea, a thousand miles

away. The good brother said indeed that, when pilgrims came and had spent two or three days there, they referred to their return journey as "going back to the world."

So, since there is no help for it, let us go back to the world—even down to Barcelona. It is modern indeed—an old city, once the competitor of Madrid for the honor of becoming capital of the great Spanish monarchy—but thriving now, flourishing and modern. Great ships in the port, and great wagons in the streets, and a modern triumphal arch, and parks, and what not! Thirty thousand French residents settled there—no augury for piety, that! And a university, too—about as bad as the foreign colony and the roving maritime population! We were set on our guard over and over again not to regard Barcelona as typical of Spain.

Well, what did we find, after all? Such an organization of practical Catholicity and such a system of manly piety that we doubt whether the devout female sex maintains there its general pre-eminence, in face of the business men and university students, and the professional men, both of law and of medicine. There is a St. Vincent de Paul's Association for the leisured classes of both sexes, and each is about 400 members strong, active, assiduous and systematic. There is a Congregation of Charity in each of the parishes to meet the cases of need, when there is no question of providing for the sick, and when, consequently, the St. Vincent de Paul members do not intervene. Besides all this, there is a most remarkable organization of men to be seen here which perhaps has not its like anywhere—a Congregation of the Blessed Virgin and St. Aloysius, or what we call simply a Sodality, consisting of 1139 members, university students and professors, business and professional men. Besides attending to their own devout and spiritual life, these members branch out into a complete system of all the works of charity and zeal which are the proper development of such a society or sodality as theirs. There are not only regularly organized sections for the propagation of various devotions, but also for the advancement of Sunday Communion, for active work among the laboring classes on Sundays, for imparting and fostering catechetical instruction in the bosom of families. There is a large section, consisting of thirteen bands of catechists, who teach children in one or two churches of the city, and the lowest attendance of children during the past year was 440, the highest 720, in the series of forty-two Sundays, when catechism was taught. There is a section, again, of sodalists, 340 in number, who visit a great hospital every Sunday and some twenty other feasts; 11,796 visits were thus paid by these gentlemen to individual sick persons in that one hospital of Santa Cruz during one year. Then a body of twenty are in the service of

another hospital; and outside of all these there are the sections for intellectual work, those which are called academies, conducted by members and for members, and each of them, like the sections for works of piety, organized with its own officers and rules. There are thus academies of law, philosophy, medicine, sciences, literature, historical criticism, Catalonian literature, music, fine arts, the German and English languages. The presidents of these sections are professors of the university, or men eminent in their respective branches, while the members are chiefly the university and professional students. But the basis of all these subsidiary organizations is exclusively the life of Christian piety and devotion, under the patronage of the Immaculate Virgin and St. Aloysius Gonzaga; and this qualification is so inexorably insisted on, that for deficiencies on this score a steady elimination of members is carried into effect each twelve months. Thus for the year previous to the last 180 names were dropped from the roll of members.

Now we consider that, when men or women will lend their time and be lavish of their personal service in works of faith and high devotion, there is nothing they will not do. The giving of money and means is not the test of solid devotion or lively faith. In America we know, and Fr. Faber formulated the same complaint about England, people are only too glad to give money in order to be expected to give neither time nor service—a good use, no doubt, of the mammon of iniquity, to bestow it on the things of God, but not so good an intention, that of getting dispensed from doing something better.

The fundamental idea of this sodality is thus stated for the members, that “what is wanted in the modern world is a body of saints, saints who live in the world, who may communicate by the heroism of their own zeal and abnegation some life and warmth to a society moribund with the disease of Liberalism, and who may purify a corrupt atmosphere with the generous influences of their own efforts and example.”

Such, then, is the material of active Christian life which we met with in Barcelona. But Barcelona is not typical of Spain, we were told. Barcelona has too many foreign elements in it; it has a floating maritime population in it; it has anarchists, who threw dynamite bombs at the last solemn procession of Corpus Christi, just when the governor and magistrates were walking past in the ranks. Barcelona is very rich, and there are other wicked things about it. We will not defend Barcelona against Spaniards; they ought to know. But we can understand the wonder of ecclesiastical authorities in other countries, and even of Nuncios sent from Rome, when, in the face of such Christian life, they are desired

to understand that things are going on very badly in Spain ; that, if a remedy be not applied, the affairs of religion and the Church will reach the very worst state, and so forth. One might be permitted to arch his eyebrows and repeat the exclamation of the journalist (probably a wicked Orangeman) who was permitted to see the reception given a high Roman Catholic dignitary in the city of Belfast. It was during Lent, on a fast-day, and after describing the menu the writer exclaimed : " Pray, if this is a fast, what is a feast ?"

And when a late Nuncio celebrated a *Messe de campagne*, or military Mass, before 50,000 of the troops, and was served and supported by generals, marshals, cabinet ministers, royalty, we may comprehend how, completely carried away by his feelings as he was on the occasion, he may have wonderingly reflected : If all this is such wicked Liberalism, where can faith, devotion and virtue be ?

#### IV.

But there we have the watchword of those Christian heroes of Barcelona, that they are to communicate some life and warmth " to a society moribund with the disease of Liberalism." And now that we have taken a passing look at the physiognomy of Spanish life, we may find it possible to define this Liberalism, which is called a disease, and a fatal disease, since society is said to be moribund with it. People do not die of a headache or a vertigo, of a maimed arm or a limping foot. There must be some attack on the vitals of society if Liberalism is making the noble Christianity of Spain enter on a path of sorrow to the grave.

We must notice that it is in the nature of a fatal disease to be deadly in all its stages—not only at its termination, when it actually kills, but at its beginning and at the middle of its course, when it ushers the subject into the narrow path, when it places the patient on the inevitable decline. It is more logical to stop the disease at the beginning than to arrest it at some aggravated stage. And in this respect we must pay the Catholics of Spain the well-deserved tribute of saying that they are the most logical people at present in Europe. You will find the disease elsewhere in an acute stage ; elsewhere again in the malignant form ; in other places it has already done its work, and the subject has passed out of the social world as a live Catholic nation. In other places, again, this disease has no place whatever ; people left the range of its action and infection when they passed out of Catholic Christendom several centuries ago. In Spain, which divides with Belgium the honor of being the last surviving nation of Catholic Christendom and of the ages of faith, the issue is, " Stop the beginnings," *Principiis obsta*.

Thus then, to define terms, all that falls to-day under the head

of society, based on the Revolution, is outside of the question of Liberalism. And almost all Protestant nations, as they are found in life and action to-day, are practically based on the Revolution. This term Revolution signifies the atheistic principles on which the great upheaval at the end of last century took place. It signifies civilization without religion, still more civilization without a church, which is nothing else but religion organically constituted in concrete form. The Revolution means Naturalism, or social and political principles which will have nothing at all to do with supernatural faith or teachings, with supernatural moral rules or guides, in any concern of public life. Brought down into private life, where really they take their rise, the principles of the Revolution mean the Autonomy of Reason, or the independence of each private man and his conscience with regard to all authority outside of himself. It has no use for God or a divine society under God. This is the range of what is conveyed by the term "Principles of the Revolution," or simply "The Revolution." And these phrases may now be observed in use among American writers, as derived from European parlance. Liberalism has nothing to do with such a world of life and action.

Liberalism begins within those social lines where the Christian organization of society has not been absolutely lost. This Christian organization of society, otherwise called Christendom, meant that the Church maintained her attitude towards the body politic of a Christian nation, just as when she had contributed to form the nation. The life, the action, the movements, the aspirations of the body politic were under the guidance of Christian principles as declared by the Church, and the nation was instinct with the religious and moral life communicated by the immediate and direct action of the Church. The State was the body, the Church the soul, and both together formed a Christian society. Protestant nations which abandoned the faith retained the forms and outlines of such a composite society, but only as a corpse may appear like to the living man that was, when the soul is gone forever. Various Catholic nations kept the reality, of which the great conspicuous instance to-day is Spain.

Now the general idea of the modern disease which can prey upon such a Christian organization of the body politic may be given in some such terms as these: that it is a set of principles or tenets forming a politico-religious system, according to which the State is independent of the Church and of religion; that, given the two bound up still in one organism, the State is free and regardless of the teaching, direction, morality, life of the Church.

Such independence may naturally be threefold. The State, or civil body politic, may declare itself so independent as to make

the Church simply a dependant. It makes a bureau of religion and its ministers, as it does of the departments of war or the navy. Its formula is "*Ecclesia in Statu.*" It is the liberalism which, if carried out, means pure schism, as in Russia, or pure Protestantism, as in England or Prussia. It is what the Protestant cantons have tried on the Catholic cantons of Switzerland. It is the same which Bismarck tried with the noble Catholic warriors of Germany, and he went to Canossa.

A second degree of Liberalism, more mitigated in its form, is that which considers it possible for Church and State to move quite freely and quite independently of one another, though bound up in one social organism by many essential ties. Its formula is: "*A Free Church in a Free State.*" Of course it does not correspond to its formula; it never will and never can. It requires dupes to believe the knaves who bandy such a formula about. There were plenty of such dupes in Italy when Count Cavour mobilized the troops, which his formula was intended to disguise. He knew well enough what he meant. He died pressing the hand of the priest who stood by and repeating his creed: "*A Free Church in a Free State.*" The dupes themselves have learnt since what he meant.

There is a third form of Liberalism, consisting in a stage of the disease much less advanced than either of the former, and its classic ground at present is Spain, for that is the classic ground of Catholicity pure and undefiled. There, as we observed before, every one must stand well as a Catholic, in order to stand on his feet at all. There radicals themselves must pose as Catholics, or they will find themselves nowhere at the polls. There a couple of chambers, stocked with Liberals and Freemasons, could never think of approaching a measure, however dear to them, if the body of bishops were united in sentiment against it. The disease, in such circumstances, can circulate only in its most intangible and subtle forms. And there is no formula for it, though it has quite a number of precious maxims.

It may be supposed to speak in this wise: The State, we admit, is by its nature subordinate to the Church, as the body is to the soul. But consider that in its purely civil sphere the State is and always was independent. It minds the police, and applies the laws, and in many other ways it has always been independent of the Church. In our times the condition of men's minds has so changed that it is prudent not to proclaim too much the dependence of the State upon the Church in any respect. On the contrary, in view of modern progress and advanced civilization, it is proper to enlarge our views with respect to greater freedom of action on the part of the State. Lo! all the world has freedom of

the press. All the world gives freedom to all kinds of worship. Education is a very proper arm for the culture of the people in constitutional life and principles. Why should the Church interfere?

This is eloquently plaintive. It should be noticed, however, that the "interference" of the Church consists simply in requiring that Christian education be given, and by competent persons—persons competent on the score of their Catholicity. It consists in requiring that the constitution be observed, according to which there is only one religion recognized, and that the Catholic religion. It consists in requiring similarly that pestilential publications be not permitted, in defiance of law, of precedent, and of all antecedents. But, pleads this Liberalism: "Modern progress, if you please! Civilization, for goodness' sake!"

Observe, it adduces no motives from the side of dire necessity. There is no question of tolerating a necessary evil. Its wantonness shows itself in operating without necessity, in violating actual conditions. It inserts the thin end of the wedge, to contrive a new condition of things, where it can and how it can. It moves forward that column, so famous in all modern tactics, the column of "accomplished facts," and when, without authorization in either national constitution or precedent, without brief or charter, it has posted accomplished facts all round about—as in a press let loose to print all kinds of error and vileness, in Protestant temples opened, or Masonic lodges recognized, in education put into the unshackled hands of laymen or of professors far advanced as "strong minds"—then the accomplished facts will have accomplished a new order of conditions, and the new conditions will render necessary what there was no earthly necessity for at the beginning, and what every reason of law, justice and fairness forbade from the start.

This is that form of the disease known as "Catholic Liberalism," or "Liberal Catholicism."

The press, we know, is always one of the first powers brought into the service of modern ideas. It makes possible all kinds of law and legislation, for it creates what is called public opinion. And who is there that does not read the press and enter into that helpless mass of an intellectual proletariat which contributes its softened brains to swell public opinion? Hence a press, in the hands of liberals, produces every shade and variety of liberalistic notions among the good Catholics of Spain. These people may be your best friends, and you do not know what to do with them. They may be in responsible posts, and you cannot touch them. They are at the foot of the altar; they confess and they communicate, and the poison is circulating all the while in their veins;

and, repeating Freemason slang, they say, with inimitable innocence: "O, yes! The curé should mind his sacristy and his candles, and leave us to manage our own affairs outside." This class of people is incorrigible; they are too innocent to be corrected.

A couple of examples—less innocent, but more conspicuous. A month ago, on the 6th of February, a man died at Turin who had always been a Catholic; he confessed, he communicated regularly. As far as appears, he had always done so; and he received the Sacraments duly on his death-bed. But he had an idea in his head—one imbibed, no doubt, in the earlier days of Italian liberalism, when things looked so plausible and so true, and the dupes believed them all—that the Pope had no right to a temporal domain. So this good Catholic accepts the commission to bombard the Pope in Rome, leads his army thither, bombards the city, takes it, and goes on a good Catholic as before—and dies so! That was Raphael Cadorna, commander of the gallant army which "liberated" Rome from the Pope. Who can ever correct such a class of men, or smooth again a brain which a crooked press has ravelled up in a man's head? But the Lord is merciful—more so than we should be.

Another specimen of a liberal Catholic. Just the other day, the Duke of Orleans, representative of the French Catholic monarchy, was gracious enough to decline standing for the candidature of Brest, with a view to filling the post lately occupied by Monsignore d'Hulst. He declined, because the place was desired for the Abbé Gayraud, who is a Catholic republican in the sense which the Holy Father has advocated. The Duke said nice things of the French episcopate when paying this act of deference to their interests. But he took care to throw out an ugly remark: "If it is the monarchical tradition," he said, "to oppose resolutely the tendencies of the Church towards political power, it is also the tradition to support religious liberties with due regard and protection." Here is the ravelled brain again. If the French monarchy had ever been built up as a solid Christian power, it had been owing to the co-operation and fostering influences of the Catholic episcopate; and there has scarcely been an instance of invasion into a forbidden territory, as between Church and State in a Catholic society, to compare with that of the Bourbon monarchy on the sacred rights of the Church, for instance, in the case of the Gallican articles. But all this historical truth is lost under a slang phrase of Liberalism, "the tendencies of the Church towards obtaining political power."

And now, with regard to Spain, it is certainly a feast of faith and devotion which greets the sense in that Christian land; but it may also be a fast. For, like the meal at Belfast, which the

Orangeman criticized, and which could also be a fast if it was only a single meal that day instead of three ; so all the riches of Spanish piety may still be lacking in something, if we consider, not what is, but what should be there. It may be worse than a fast, if what is wanting is not a mere privation, but means a substitution of poison instead of food, of disease instead of health. And if the disease is in its nature fatal, we come to the explanation of those words in the programme of the Christian men at Barcelona : "A society moribund with the disease of Liberalism."<sup>1</sup>

## V.

Having looked at Spain as it is, we had hoped to take a view of it in its glorious Catholic past. We should have done so by taking up the reflex view presented in the pages of such writers as Prescott and Irving. But space fails us, and we can only indicate the line of thought.

Going back from present times, beyond the date of the great Revolution, we find two chief divisions of Spanish history. One is that reaching from the golden times of Ferdinand and Isabella down to the troubles of the Revolution, which entailed soon afterwards the loss of the Spanish Empire in South America, and left the legacy of a prodigious series of revolutions down there ever since. It was in this period that the new world was discovered, colonized, civilized and made Christian. The other division of history was earlier, and was signalized by a national life of intense religious faith ; of continuous struggles against the power of the infidels ; of suffering, heroic endurance and chivalric ardor, which proved more than a match in the course of long centuries for the prowess of the Arabic invaders.

For the knowledge which the American public has about Spanish history, it is chiefly under obligations to the two authors whom we have mentioned. We have no doubt that both of them contributed to enlarge the mind of the non-Catholic world, and to enable Protestants to understand something of the nobility, chivalry and other national qualities of a characteristically Catholic people. They did by means of history what Walter Scott is credited with having done in the region of romance. The novelist, who took the Middle Ages for the subject of many of his stories, opened the eyes of a modern generation to circumstances of history which they had never known of before ; and the Catholic Church gained by the process ; for the Middle Ages were all Catholic. So, with a degree of accuracy more or less on a par

<sup>1</sup> Compare the two volumes by P. V. (Villada, S.J.) : *Casus Conscientiæ his præsertim temporibus accommodati. De Liberalismo* : Bruxellis, Vromant, 1885.

with that of the Scotch novelist, the two American historians impressed the English-speaking world with some idea of the beauty and purity to be found in a religion whereof the virtue, honor, and nobility of their subject were at least an appendage. The genuine enthusiasm which we witnessed a few years ago in the United States, when all classes of persons joined in reverencing the memory and character of Queen Isabella and of Christopher Columbus, seems to have been partly a result of the familiarity with those great personages, acquired by Americans in the classic pages of Irving and Prescott. And, in the centennial celebration, deference was shown to the most conspicuously Catholic objects, to altars, crucifixes, chapels, and even to the reproduction of a monastery. The emblems of devotion were not spared on the monumental postage-stamps, by which a Federal department conveyed an expression of its sentiments on every letter and package issued from America to the four quarters of the globe.

And yet alas! What does the world know of Spain from Mr. Prescott? He has given us the body without the soul. The complexion is utterly wanting to the features, for the soul is not there to suffuse them with color. And he has added traits of positive ugliness—not indeed foreign to a corpse, which alone he had before him to depict. And what does the world know of Spain from Mr. Irving? He has given us a caricature.

True to the style of gifts in which he excelled, Washington Irving wrote of Spain as he wrote of Knickerbocker history, in the terms and with the appreciation of a litterateur and a wit. It was largely fun; and, to give himself full play, he professed to derive his materials for the "Conquest of Granada" from an unknown manuscript of an unknown author, from the "manuscript chronicle of Fray Antonio Agapida." It is not necessary to say more, except perhaps to add, what his French translator remarks, on noting this *jeu d'esprit*: that the author had employed this device, "in order to put his work into a picturesque form and style, and to mix up therein certain superstitious ideas in keeping with the time when this war took place, and which, without this device, he should have been forced to dispense with, owing to the gravity of historical narration."<sup>1</sup> In other words, it is no history at all, but a "grandfather's tale" for children who are Protestants, from a grandpa who is a Protestant, too.

As to Mr. Prescott, we will animadvert upon three points, not because they are the only subjects of criticism, but because they serve very well to give us a reflex view of Spanish history. One is the origin of the brilliant civilization of Spain. Another, its monas-

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire de la Conquête de Grenade, etc.* Traduite de l'Anglais par J. Cohen; Louvain, 1830. Note to Introduction.

ticism or ecclesiasticism. A third, the cruelties practiced in South America.

This historian considers that the civilization of Spain, as, indeed, of Europe also, was largely due, in the latter part of the Middle Ages, to the presence and intellectual activity of the Arab kingdom in the Spanish peninsula. The Saracens, he says, came like a torrent, just at the time when the last vestiges alone remained of ancient civilization. They swept away all that remained of it; but they brought a fertilizing germ, which, as the waters retired, imparted a new life and animation to the country. And the intellectual development which marked subsequent ages in Europe was due to the spirit first imbibed in the Arabic schools of Spain, and then brought away by faithful disciples to other parts of Europe.<sup>1</sup> The chapter in which he makes such slashing assertions bids fair to rank with the essays of the omniscient and infallible Macaulay.

We will not examine such a theory on its merits. We content ourselves with setting aside of such wild statements two passages from Protestant historians, men a little more careful and erudite than Prescott, and contemporaries of his. M. Guizot, speaking of the Catholic Church, and in particular of the Church in Spain, presents us with a very large picture, and considerably different. He says: "She had in a manner assailed barbarism at all points, to civilize by subduing it. In Spain it was the Church itself that commenced the revival of civilization. There, instead of the old German assemblies, the assembly which takes the helm is the Council of Toledo, and, though distinguished laymen assisted at it, the bishops were the ruling spirit. Open the Code of the Visigoths. It is not a barbarian code. It was manifestly digested by the philosophers of the day, by the clergy."<sup>2</sup> "The Church," he says elsewhere, "had agitated all the great questions which concern man; she was solicitous about all the problems of his nature, about all the chances of his destiny. Hence her influence on modern civilization has been immense, greater, perhaps, than has ever been imagined by her most ardent adversaries or her most serious advocates. Absorbed either in defending or in assaulting her, they have considered her only from a polemical point of view, and they have failed, I am convinced, to judge her with fairness and to take her full dimensions."<sup>3</sup> We do not pause to note the assumption here of this Protestant savant, who is pedantic enough to imagine that he knows more about the Catholic Church than

<sup>1</sup> *History of Ferdinand and Isabella*, ch. viii., "The Arabs in Spain."

<sup>2</sup> Guizot, *Histoire Générale de la Civilisation en Europe*, 3me, leçon.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 5me leçon.

her own doctors. We are only matching the French historian of European civilization with the American historian of Spain.

Similarly, an Englishman, no friend of Catholicity, will tell us what the Church of the Dark Ages—observe the Dark Ages—accomplished for the civilization of later times. Mr. Hallam asks the question: "If it be demanded by what cause it happened that a few sparks of ancient learning survived throughout this long winter (of barbaric invasions), we can only ascribe their preservation to the establishment of Christianity. Religion alone made a bridge, as it were, across the chaos, and has linked the two periods of ancient and modern civilization. Without this connecting principle Europe might, indeed, have awakened to intellectual pursuits, and the genius of recent times needed not to be invigorated by the imitation of antiquity. But the memory of Greece and Rome would have been feebly preserved by tradition, and the monuments of those nations might have excited, on the return of civilization, that vague sentiment of speculation and wonder with which we now contemplate Persepolis or the Pyramids. It is not, however, from religion simply that we derive this advantage, but from religion as it was modified in the Dark Ages;" that is to say, from the monasticism and ecclesiasticism proper to the Middle Ages.

Here comes in the second point, which we notice in this Protestant philosophy of Spanish history; it is the weakness of the Spanish nation towards priests and monks. Our American historians mention, either with pleasantry or with covert sneer, how the Spanish cavaliers, nobles, king or queen, no sooner came into possession of a place than they incontinently gave way to their ruling weakness and founded monasteries, built churches, equipped and endowed them. Yet, at the same time, these writers mention also that nobles, ecclesiastics, monks had a propensity for spending their great revenues, not on themselves, but on the poor and their tenants, and on the establishment of divers works of beneficence. This is clear all through history, and noted by all kinds of writers. But it is not, perhaps, so clear whether these American writers on Spain considered this, too, a weakness, and whether our modern civilized cruelties and pauperism suited their tastes better.

Oh, no! Here we reach the third point. What more harrowing than Mr. Prescott's description of Spanish cruelties in Peru, and the Spanish thirst for gold! The civilization of South America would seem to have consisted largely of mere bloodshed and cruelty for the sake of gold! But how does it come about

---

<sup>1</sup> Hallam, *Europe During the Middle Ages*, ch. ix., part. i.

that to-day in Mexico there are ten or eleven millions of Indians to only some three millions of whites; and so, too, in other regions, quite in the same proportion? And in the United States where are they? Cain, where is thy brother Abel? O, Englishman of New England, yes, and Dutchman of New Amsterdam, so distinguished for your humanity that even the domesticated negro dare not sit in the same car with you, what has become of the poor savage Indians? Are eleven millions to be found to-day for any three millions of whites? or are barely two hundred and fifty thousand to be found in the civilization of seventy millions of whites? And, so lofty-minded as to despise the Spanish adventurer, who thirsted for gold in Peru and in Mexico, what has been the story of your California, and your magnanimity, magnificent only in the stupendous proportions of your avarice? And that mighty "force of character," which bears your conquering genius over the weaker races, till they are stamped out of existence—your "stronger race," as is pleasantly said, before which a feebler line vanishes as the "snow when March winds blow"—that "intellect" of Protestants, who, as a Scotchman said, "rank higher in the scale of intellect than Catholics," while "Catholics in the neighborhood of Protestants are more intellectual than those at a distance from them," what does it all come to, or rather what did it all come to in the New Englander before the Puritan himself disappeared as snow, when March winds blow? A Protestant Englishman answers the Scotchman: "*By intellect*," says William Corbett, "does not the Scotchman mean the capacity to make, not books and pictures (that is, the genius of literature and fine art), but checks, bills, bonds, exchequer-bills, inimitable notes and the like? Does he not mean loan-jobbing and stock-jobbing, insurance-booking, annuities at 10 per cent., kite-flying and all the *intellectual* proceedings of Change Alley? . . . Ah, in that case, I confess that he is right. On this scale Protestants do rank high indeed. And I should think it next to impossible for a Catholic to live in their neighborhood without being much *more intellectual*; that is to say, much more of a Jewish knave, than if he lived at a distance from them."<sup>1</sup>

Faith and charity, says a Mexican writer, were the story of California till your Anglo-American hypocrites, panegyrists of labor and industry, economical through avarice, frugal through necessity, despisers of the gold they have, because they never have enough of it, espied California gold in the distance, a land wrested from the hand of the weak by the mightier hand of violence, and then behold them flying from fatherland, family, friends, behold

---

<sup>1</sup> Cobbett's *History of the Reformation*, end of Letter I.

them plunging into all kinds of perils and of crimes, and dying content because they expire on a heap of gold! "And then do you not smile when they preach liberty, felicity for the whole world, believing themselves invested with the divine mission of propagating civilization all over the earth? But let us leave it to Divine Providence to make retribution for the good and the evil, which every one has wrought in this life."

THOS. HUGHES, S.J.

---

### SOME REFLECTIONS ON EDMUND BURKE'S CENTENARY.

IN striking a balance against Ireland recently, some critic discovered that that afflicted island never produced a Shakespeare. It is as true of England to say that she never produced a Burke. And in looking around for some equal for Burke, after his death, a critic of some note places him, as regards imaginative powers, on a level with Shakespeare. Dr. Johnson, who was his uncompromising foe in politics, entertained as high an opinion of his oratory. One of his acquaintances asked him if Burke did not remind him of Tullius Cicero. "No, sir," was the great man's reply, "but Cicero reminds me of Burke."

This year is the centenary of Edmund Burke's demise, and the event is commemorated in Ireland in a public fashion. It is time to reverse the judgment of Goldsmith's epigram. Though Edmund Burke belongs to Ireland by nativity and genius, he belongs to mankind by such ties as sympathy with aspirations of enlightened liberty and profound political wisdom always furnish. His arraignment of adventurer rule in India is a legacy to freedom for all time and all peoples. For Americans his plea for Conciliation constitutes a claim which nothing can ever cancel. And for Catholicism his memory must always be held in reverence because of his disinterested and priceless services.

Brute courage is the property of the million; how very few know what extraordinary strength of soul is demanded of the man who feels impelled by duty to stand up alone in an age of bitter prejudice and speak in behalf of justice and moderation to the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Biblioteca Nacional y Extranjera*, "Historia de la Antigua ó Baja California, del Padre F. J. Clavijero," etc. Mejico; 1852. Editor's Preface.

powerless and those whom oppression has stung into resistance! It is most difficult for us, living in a more tolerant day, to form even an approximate notion of the enmities which Burke aroused, when he dared to speak in defence of the American colonists' action, or rather in apology for their presumption, and at another time in favor of a relaxation of the Draconic legislation which made a man's religion the test of his freedom or his legal outlawry. In Burke's day, to be a Catholic in England was synonymous with being a Jacobite, and being a Jacobite with something like a son of Belial. An Irish Papist especially was an object of aversion as much as a Fiji cannibal. It was only a couple of generations, indeed, from the time when it was a matter of serious belief in England that Irishmen belonged to an inferior natural order of which the caudal appendage of the ape was a distinguishing sign.

Not as yet, it should be remembered, had any lesson of adversity taught Great Britain that there was any distinction between colonists and slaves. Hitherto her rule over her colonies had been unquestioned despotism. Not for a moment was it supposed that the provisions of Magna Charta or the Act of Settlement had any force or application to the condition of the colonies, or that those offshoots existed for anything but the glory and benefit of the mother country. As for the feeling toward Papists in general, it may be to some extent estimated by such fanatical outbreaks as the No-Popery riots linked with the name of Lord George Gordon. Burke himself was in some danger from the violence of the fanatical rioters, and his house was placed under military protection. And it is useful to remember that the constituency which he for some time represented, the city of Bristol, has long borne an evil reputation as a hotbed of religious bigotry as well as narrow commercial jealousy. It is not quite half a century since it was showing an example to the Know-nothings of the United States by burning down convents and sacking churches, as well as shooting men and women for the crime of being Papists. It was little wonder that such a constituency failed to relish the action of its representative when he ventured to advocate a relaxation of the commercial fetters which English jealousy had coiled around the limbs of Irish trade. Bristol and Liverpool were in those days the two ports which reflected the commercial spirit of the England of the day. The crushing out of commercial rivalry by fair means or foul, and the development of the slave trade, were the two principles by which they lived and moved and had their being. Slavery and smuggling were the methods by which their merchants in time became millionaires.

By writers of the present day Edmund Burke is classified as a

Conservative. The term will not fit. He was a foe to innovation in constitutional methods, certainly, but he was no less a foe to what was unconstitutional in governmental methods and departmental procedure. This is not the spirit of latter-day Conservatism. To perpetuate every abuse and shield every official guilty of despotism or corruption is conceived to be the duty of a Conservative statesman or loyal party-man of the present generation. This is the spirit in which the affairs of Ireland and India have been administered by every Conservative government within living memory.

The truth about Burke's politics seems to be that he experienced during his public life that unconscious metamorphosis in opinion which frequently results from contact with the realities instead of the theories of the struggle of social development. His principles might have been always the same; the mistakes he made during the vicissitudes of politics seem to have arisen in the endeavor to make them apply to different peoples. The temperaments of races, the prejudices, the habits of thought, the traditions of government, and a host of other considerations have to be taken into account by the philosopher who would strive to lay down an ethical code for a country foreign to his own.

Inconsistency in the advocacy of political reform has been the most serious charge advanced against this great philosopher. That large-minded policy which he advised for the treatment of the revolting American colonies never once entered into his views when his mental vision was turned toward insurgent France. He had no tears of compassion for the miseries of the French people; his monarchical sympathies were so ebullient that they completely blurred his vision, on all other subjects usually so keen and clear. This is one of the almost unaccountable aberrations of a divinely-gifted intellect. In the American quarrel all his aspirations lay on the side of the struggling democracy; in the long and splendid crusade against adventurer rule in India it was the sufferings of the people which seemed to him as the woes of Hecuba. Hence his insensibility and obtuseness to the wretchedness of a peasantry only a few hours' sail from his own shore, and whose condition was perfectly familiar to many of his most intimate friends, if not to himself, cannot but fill us with amazement. But what amazes us still more is the gift of prescience which seemed to have been his about the final outcome of the downward trend of France. His direful forebodings were fulfilled almost to the letter. If he had the prophet's foresight, it is astonishing that his fulminations were always addressed to the side which was powerless for anything save the awakening of that fatal sympathy whose force at length created a brood of sanguinary monsters, and, with the fury

of a liberated flood, swept throne and altar and immemorial institutions away in one awful wrack.

But it is not to estimate the failings, or the apparent failings, of any great man that people celebrate his centenary. We have to bear in mind the limitations of human nature, and, when dealing especially with characters like that of Burke, we must remember that if principle be their guiding star, as it undoubtedly was in his case, it might be pleaded that they did not really err, since error lies in intent rather than in the consequences of mistake. We see in his attitude toward the electors of Bristol that Burke preferred the dictates of his own judgment and conscience to the selfish wishes of any constituency, and so set up a model for parliamentary conduct which unhappily but too few have been found independent enough to follow. We must give him credit not only for integrity, but for enlightenment, in the profound and generous policy which he had the courage to advocate toward the American colonies as well as toward the Irish Roman Catholics. The bitter hostility which such sentiments evoked cannot at this distance of time be easily estimated. It is when we consider what course he adopted in regard to these, the most vital questions of his time, that we find the unfairness of the general estimate of his character. Expediency, the critics say, was his guiding star; whatever had been found practicable and useful in the past ought not to be departed from in the present. On the contrary, Goldsmith's verdict, that he was "too fond of the right to pursue the expedient" is found to be far nearer to the truth.

One of the main arguments against Burke's consistency is the different attitude he assumed toward Irish Catholics and English Dissenters. At an early period of his parliamentary career he had pleaded for a relaxation of the statutes which pressed hard on this large body; later on he stubbornly and strenuously opposed any such concession. The reason for this change of mind is to be found in the growth of radical ideas among the Dissenters themselves. In 1772, when they had his support, they sought from parliament relief merely as a passive and suffering element; in 1787, when he antagonized their demand for relief from the grievance of the Test Act, they were an aggressive organization, with a plan of action against the regular Church Establishment. Burke was a reverent supporter of that estate of the realm, for such the Establishment, secured as it was by the terms of the Act of Settlement, was in the most unqualified sense. Anything that savored of a design against the Constitution or the established order of things in England, which to his mind was the true ideal of orderly government, he looked upon with horror. It was the avowed intention of the Dissenters to play Guy Fawkes (according to the

panic-myth) with the English Church fabric. One of their ablest pamphleteers, Dr. Priestley, declared in a public print that they were "wisely placing, as it were, grain by grain, a train of gunpowder, to which the match would one day be laid to blow up the fabric of error, which could never again be raised upon the same foundation." John Morley, who dwells with astonishment upon this apparent case of political tergiversation in Burke's life, and as a thing inexplicable, seems to have overlooked these important facts. He makes no mention of Priestley's pamphlet, and says nothing of the aggressive designs of the Dissenters. On the other hand, he magnifies Burke's "aberration," as he terms it, by recalling how it was at Burke's own suggestion that Fox brought forward the bill for the relief of the Dissenters as a means of strengthening his (Fox's) position. The appearance of Priestley's pamphlet (and Priestley was a personal friend of Burke's, and one on whose statements he relied) would certainly go far to explain this sudden volteface.

It is much more astonishing that Burke, with all the knowledge he possessed of the true position of affairs, did not insist that no relief should be granted the Dissenters in which the Irish Catholics did not share. Herein he would have found a true vantage-ground and placed the odium of refusing relief upon the shoulders of both political parties. His position as secretary to the Irish Chief Secretary under Lord Halifax's Viceroyalty, the personage known in history as "single-speech Hamilton," gave him an official intimacy with the social and political condition of the country which could not be otherwise obtained. In addition to the transaction of governmental business by correspondence with those connected with its administration, he had the advantage of personal observation while travelling through many districts of the island, and the interchange of views and experiences with men of position in many places. For the two years which he remained in this office he did much with voice and pen to dispel the cloud of rancor which hung over the English mind with regard to Ireland, as well as to thwart the truculent designs of those whose only panacea for the intolerable grievances of the Catholic population was the policy of "more stick." Any attempt to establish a parallel between the plight of the Irish Catholics in the eighteenth century and the position of the English Nonconformists would, except in point of common obnoxiousness to the English majority, be something analogous to a comparison between Dives and Lazarus.

It was Dr. Johnson, an English Tory of the Tories, who remarked that the cruelty meted out to the Irish population by his countrymen, once they got the upper hand in Ireland, was worse than the ten great persecutions of the Roman Empire. He was a

blunt man, and one not given to exaggeration. When Burke was in Ireland the country was at its lowest. There was more freedom and enlightenment in the most debased community of Russian serfs than in Ireland, outside the English "garrison." Mr. Froude hypocritically remarks that the absenteeism of her men of genius was a worse wrong to Ireland than the absenteeism of her landlords, and if Edmund Burke had remained in the country where Providence had placed him, he might have changed the current of its history. It is a peculiarity of writers like Froude to turn away from the facts of history in order to speculate upon what these might have been had things fallen out otherwise than as they did. It is easy to retort that men of genius were not wanting in the country, before Burke's time and after, who, with eloquence as great and earnestness still more proven, pleaded for justice for the afflicted country—even a modicum of justice—and pleaded in vain. Was Burke ever successful in any of his pleas for justice, on behalf of any one soever, in the British Parliament? At no time, in any great cause which ever stirred him to action. He aroused the sympathies of a few by his denunciations of Hastings and his understrappers, but, as for the great mass of his audience, they were of the stolid English kind—the intellect and conscience of beef and wine. These were the days when a man's status in good society was frequently determined—usually determined in the rural districts—by the number of bottles he was able to empty at an after-dinner carouse. It was before legislators drawn from this class that Burke, with fine indignation, often

". . . went on refining,  
And thought of convincing while they thought of dining."

Even so accomplished a man as Lord North, who, though an antagonist, had a warm admiration for Burke, was found so unmannerly as to fall asleep during one of his speeches, and gave the orator the opportunity to taunt him wittily with his ill manners. "I hope," he said, "government is not dead, but asleep. Brother Lazarus is not dead, but sleepeth." Sottishness in society and boorishness in the legislature were symptoms of the generally low tone of the period in public and private. There was a callousness to human suffering and an insensibility to just reproach which indicate a brutal and savage generation. We may learn how deep-seated was this savage feeling, and how reckless of outside public opinion it was, from the indifference with which Burke's splendid denunciation of the employment of the Indian tribes by the English government was received. The pictures which he painted of the horrors of war, as practiced by these ferocious auxiliaries, fell upon scoffing or indifferent ears. Another very sug-

gestive incident of the time is the fact that he used his great eloquence in vain in favor of a bill to prevent the plundering of ships, wrecked on the English coast, by the littoral population. It was universally known that in many places the people purposely decoyed ships to their ruin by false lights for the purpose of plunder; yet the Ministry dared not support the proposal to suppress this murderous custom, so strong was local feeling in favor of its continuance. There was no time at which there was a lower condition of public morality or a tenser one of religious bigotry, and yet there was never a brighter era in the English world of letters. This is the paradoxical situation which confronts us when we come to consider the ill-success of Edmund Burke as a political reformer or an opponent of despotic rule in Crown colonies.

Englishmen may describe the state of their country at this period as they may; the impartial historian must find on examination that it deserves no title but that of barbarous. Punishment of crime was ferocious; hanging was the penalty for trivial offences. The loss of ears, the pillory and the stocks were frequent penalties for lesser crimes. The prisons were reeking dens of abomination; men spent all their lives as prisoners for debt in the King's Bench and the Marshalsea prisons. In the army and navy the life was worse than in the Siberian mines. Men were flogged daily for the most trivial breaches of discipline; very many died from the merciless severity of this torture. The wooden ships of war, which Madame de Staël so beautifully describes as "floating cloisters," were filthy prisons swarming with vermin and fungus-grown from immemorial filth. Brutality of discipline was the rule in the military service as well as the naval. It is a singular fact that the great victories of Marlborough and Wellington were won with the help of soldiers paid at the rate of sixpence a day, flogged into fighting-machines by savage drill-masters, carrying on the march about a hundred pounds weight in "kit" and military weapons, squeezed into shape by heavy cross-belts with immense brass buckles, and half-garroted by a diabolical leather contrivance around the neck called a "stock," devised to compel them to keep their chins erect, to add to their martial air. The horrors of this glorious service were supposed to be compensated for by the prospect of indiscriminate massacre and loot and rape whenever the city of an enemy was taken by assault; and anyone who has read Napier's "History of the Peninsular War" will find that down to the beginning of the present century the British soldier differed not a particle from the Turk when resistance had aroused his savage instincts and the prospect of plunder and sensual gratification whetted his greed and animal desire. The spirit of the age, especially in England, was cruelty, callousness and in-

sensibility to human suffering. The masses of the people were steeped in ignorance and poverty, which in times of acute distress impelled them to frightful deeds of riot and arson, as in the case of the No-Popery riots in London, the Porteous riots in Edinburgh, and the Reform riots of a later date in Manchester, Bristol and other places.

Burke was not quite insensible to these deplorable conditions, but he seems to have been more given to the study of the political situation than to the social miseries which environed him. And yet that he was a great humanitarian as well as a keen observer of abuses, his tremendous indictment of Warren Hastings and his myrmidons affords the highest proof. Perhaps it was owing to the absorbing character of his pursuit of this master-subject and the development of the French Revolution that he failed to note the ingrained miseries of the system under which the common people at home were struggling. Though he was not altogether insensible to them, as we find in more than one of his works, he firmly believed that no change in the political system at home was desirable, as the Constitution, if it were only observed in Parliament and the administration of the laws, was sufficient for the securing and preservation of all liberties and rights of the people at large.

Burke's great misfortune seems to have been that he lived in a wrong age. The three tremendous national tragedies in America, India and France were too strong for his sympathetic nature. He became absorbed in them so completely as to lose the sense of proportion between evils at home and evils abroad. The mad excesses of the French revolutionary freaks blinded him to the racialities of a system in Ireland which had reduced the people to a condition immeasurably more desperate than that of the French when they rose up against their oppressors. Burke was well aware of their condition; he often strove to direct the attention of the government to the necessity for redress; but he never threw himself into the subject with the same tremendous earnestness with which he attacked the iniquities of Hastings. It would not be correct to say that he viewed the sufferings of subject peoples with British eyes, for those eyes at that period were those of indifference, callousness and cruelty. But he regarded them as a good Englishman ought to regard them—a man who loved the substance of constitutional liberty and not mere platitudes about its excellences and its spirit. It was the inevitable consequence, no doubt, of his living in an English atmosphere for the greater part of his life. For the short time that he was connected with Irish affairs, as "help" to Mr. Hamilton, he certainly took up a most determined position in defence of the Irish peasantry; and

at different periods of his life he advocated the claims of the Catholics to religious freedom as strenuously as he ever advocated anything. But the theme never stirred him as did the thoughts on "A Regicide Peace."

The complexities of his mind are still further apparent when we consider the alarm with which he viewed any tendencies on the part of Ireland to resort to those measures of resistance in palliation of which he argued so eloquently in the case of the American colonists. Between oppression in Ireland and oppression in America the difference, in reality, was only one of degree and geographical location. Unjust taxation and restricted commerce were the material injustices sought to be inflicted and maintained in either case. The organization of the United Irishmen he regarded from the outset with keen distrust, although it was at the beginning a perfectly constitutional movement, and only became a secret society when the persistent refusal of redress of flagrant injustices convinced its members that nothing was to be got from the English Cabinet by argument and moral pressure. The demands of Grattan and the Volunteers he regarded with no less apprehension. "Will no one stop that madman, Grattan?" was his panic-cry when he read of the Convention of Dungannon and the resolutions on independence which were the outcome of that remarkable meeting.

Perhaps we may find some explanation of many of Burke's apparent inconsistencies with his own theories in the horror he had of mob rule. He had seen a great part of London burned down by a mob, and beheld scores of drunken wretches shot down in the streets after they had had their fill of murder and drink. He had seen how similar conduct in Edinburgh was encouraged and excused by the clergy and the respectable people of the Scotch capital on the ground that it was well to let Rome see how much in earnest the Scotch people were in their hatred of Popery. These things made him dread the idea of conceding anything to popular clamor in his later years. But when we remember that Henry Grattan was quite as ardent an admirer of the British Constitution as he himself was, we find it difficult to believe that Burke was more than a theorist when it came to a question of actual application of constitutional principles in the higher affairs of a nation. His anger over the concession of the Irish claim for free trade and legislative independence proves this; for the chief ground he alleged was the odium the Ministry incurred by yielding to energetic agitation what they had denied to peaceful remonstrance. It is difficult to believe that any sincere lover of his country could have preferred the appearance of constitutional etiquette to a reform of such magnitude in the relations of Ireland to England as

that involved in Grattan's Bill of Rights. Nor is it easier to understand how a man who had previously depicted the condition of the Irish Catholics in terms to rouse the commiseration and horror of mankind at large could describe England, as Burke did in opposing the separation of the Legislatures, as Ireland's "guardian angel."

Still, taken for all in all, we find much more consistency in Burke's public course than in that of any of the great statesmen of our own day. Take the cases of Mr. Gladstone and the late Lord Beaconsfield, for instance. In his early days Mr. Gladstone was a Conservative in politics, while Disraeli, his lifelong bitter rival, began his jaunty career as an out-and-out Radical; and both had exactly reversed their political positions when Disraeli's career came to a close. So, too, with Prince Bismarck. He began political life as a Radical, and when he retired from it he was a decidedly staunch Conservative. Fidelity to party has often made most public men of our day recant opinions or espouse principles formerly entertained, or denounced as pernicious; and so long as any of them can show reasonable grounds for such a change he can still preserve the respect of the community.

We have spoken of John Morley's "Life of Burke," or rather his biographical essay, for it claims to be no more. It is, perhaps, the work most popular with present-day students, and deservedly so for its fine, scholarly style. But no one can fail to be struck by the strong secularistic animus which pervades it. Mr. Morley's sympathies are clearly more with Rousseau and the men who wrote "*Ecrasez l'Infame*" on their banners than with the constitutional or monarchical party either in France or England. Naturally, he is guarded in his expression of this bias, but an isolated phrase or sentence here and there betrays it. The conflict of principles which was going on in his mind while he was writing the book may be judged from his reference to the campaign of James the Second in Ireland as "Tyrconnell's Rebellion," a very extraordinary inversion of the facts of history in regard to the Revolution of 1688, making the Irish, who unfortunately supported the lawful King, appear as the rebels, and inferentially the successful rebels the supporters of legitimacy. In other respects, Mr. Morley's work is disserviceable. His presentation of Burke's personality is too many-sided. He lauds him as the greatest genius of modern times, and he condemns him in another group of paragraphs as a rash and inconsiderate blunderer, carried along in a fanatical course by the fury of his own blind passion. In fact, it seems, on a calm consideration of the whole portrait, that the writer had seriously taken for his cue the first two lines of Goldsmith's mocking "epitaph," and really regarded Burke as a man

"Whose genius was such  
That no one could praise it or blame it too much,"

It is, therefore, exceedingly useful for the student who desires to get a more faithful picture to take up one of the homelier sketches of Burke's own day, such as Bisset's, wherein sentences are not constructed with a view to antithetical effect, but rather a desire to the recording of bare facts, leaving the reader to deduce their meaning or moral according to his fancy or his judicial temperament. Here, too, we get some knowledge of Burke's real environment, and find a clue to many things which modern biographies render enigmatical or misleading. We are enabled, for instance, to judge of the intensity of the virus of religious hatred which raged in the days of Burke, and the enormous courage it required in any public man in England to advocate justice for the despised and detested Catholics. One of the most insidious things against which he had to contend was the secret whisper that was sent around that he was, in reality, a Catholic and had been educated at St. Omer's. Bisset is at great pains to show that such was not the case, and gives many interesting minutiae regarding his school-days at Abraham Shackleton's seminary at Ballitore, in County Carlow. Mr. Shackleton was a Quaker, and, we may perhaps assume, as liberal in his religious belief as most members of that respectable body usually were; but we cannot accept Mr. Morley's conclusion that it was from him Edmund Burke derived that magnanimity and kindness of character which marked him all through life. These qualities are natural and need no preceptor, though they may be cultivated and increased by practical example and judicious direction. The more rational explanation of Burke's liberality is to be found, it might be suggested, in his early training at home. His mother was a devout Catholic, and his father, though a Protestant, a man of very liberal principles. We know how large a share the mother's teaching and example have in moulding a man's disposition and belief, and we may be perfectly sure that it was the knowledge of the influence for virtue of the Catholic religion which was before Burke's eyes constantly for the first twelve years of his life that turned his sympathies toward Catholicism and made him resent the injustice of the interdicts and restrictions placed upon it. His manly indignation, furthermore, was stirred by the systematic policy of calumny and mendacity adopted toward the Catholic people of Ireland. One of the most common forms of misrepresentation was the description of the rising of 1641 as a religious movement having the massacre of Protestants as its main object. This transparent misrepresentation was embodied in Hume's His-

tory of England, and when Burke met the infidel author he challenged him upon the subject, and defended the Irish very warmly against the baseless charge.

But, leaving speculation aside, if we desire to find reasons for Burke's partiality toward the Catholics, we have only to consider his own marked mental and moral attributes. His sense of justice revolted against the oppression of any one individual, not to say of any one class, by another. He rarely, in all his letters or speeches on the subject, pleaded for a relaxation of the penal laws on the ground of mere policy or expediency; he argued for it on the highest moral and constitutional considerations. Especially happy was he in the argument he drew from the case of Canada and the Catholic Church established there by the French. "All our English Protestant countries revolted," he pointed out. "They joined themselves to France, and it so happened that Popish Canada was the only place which preserved its fidelity, the only place in which France got no footing, the only peopled colony which now remains to Great Britain. Vain are all the prognostics taken from ideas and passions which survive the state of things which give rise to them. . . . We had no dread for the Protestant Church which we settled there, because we permitted the French Catholics, in the fullest latitude of the description, to be free subjects. They are good subjects, I have no doubt; but I will not allow that any Canadian Catholics are better men or better citizens than the Irish of the same communion."

These sentences are particularly\* appropriate and applicable, after the lapse of a century, and in a condition of things that had no existence when they were penned. They have an undeniable bearing on the discussions of our own day, and more especially in the United States, where groundless misstatements about the loyalty of Catholics, under certain political conditions, have been sedulously disseminated. If the Canadian Catholics had been ostracized and wronged as the Irish were, their loyalty might not have been proof against the temptation to shake off the oppressor; and this is where we find the true criterion of a valid authority as between the ruling power and the people. The binding principle between the two is that of justice and the sanctity of public law, and when these are trampled underfoot systematically and deliberately for a lengthened period, the principle of resistance becomes a moral duty in the interests of all mankind.

If we sometimes find Burke using arguments that seem to appeal more to principles of expediency than equity, in favor of fair treatment for Catholics, we must remember that his logic was addressed to the enemies of the toleration for which he pleaded. Thus he is found strongly insisting that the preservation of Catholicity is

essential to the well-being of Europe, on the ground of its being one of the four great religious divisions of the world, and the evil effects which any disturbance of it as an instrument for orderly habit must have upon the remainder of society. If he had been at liberty to declare his sentiments more frankly, we might, perhaps, have heard a different line of argument from his lips; for it can hardly be that one who was so keenly sensible of the interior virtue of great things did not fully perceive the wonderful moral beauty of the spiritual side of the Catholic Church as well as the grandeur of its long career as a moulder of the varied civilizations of the old world. He was appealing to an audience upon whose ears such rhetoric must have fallen flat. His chapters on the training of the Catholic priesthood show that he had a clear perception of the higher *rôle* of a celibate clergy than that of his own church; but he did not put his thought into direct words. He sought, rather, to effect his purpose indirectly by pointing out the great difference between the Latin priesthood and that of the Greek rite, in which the clergy, being occupied with marital cares, occupy so much lower a plane in the eyes of the people. The full force of this contrast can be easily felt even without any attempt to read between the lines.

As Burke abhorred atheism, so he has left the English Church, by implication, a legacy of disapproval by his strong declarations on the subject of its recognition of divorce. He is unstinted in his praise of the Roman Catholic Church for its law and practice on this vital subject; and the fact that the Anglican bishops form an important element in the legislative machinery which moulded the divorce court into a permanent English institution is proof that his frequently expressed admiration for the Anglican Church as a great moral and Christianizing agency was one of his grand mistakes.

If the measure of true genius be the admiration of the few higher-minded, undiminished by lapse of time or mutation in theories of philosophy, then Edmund Burke stands at the head of our modern thinkers. But if the practical acceptance or rejection of his maxims and counsels be the criterion, he must be regarded as one crying in the wilderness. His denunciations of the frightful misrule of India met with no effective response until the horrors of the Indian mutiny in 1857 put an end to the oppression of the East India Company; while the awful recurring famines which desolate that gorgeous but unhappy land prove that the change substantially means nothing more than a shifting of responsibility. The only difference is that torture as an agency for the collection of taxes is abandoned by the ruling power; but the condition of the plundered millions is one long agony, with periodical whole-

sale slaughter from hunger as an intermission from the slower method. His pleadings for the enfranchisement of Irish Catholics awoke no response until the Catholics, under O'Connell, rose in their might and thundered at the gates of the English Parliament. And how ineffective his advocacy of the methods of wise conciliation for the American colonists was when perversity and injustice ruled both Cabinet and Parliament in England, we need not pause to wonder at. In all these things he was a failure, but the failures have been so splendid in their impressiveness, as great lessons for all time, that we do not regret that he was a man before his age, and a moralist too lofty for the selfish and mercantile understanding of the audience to which his monitions were addressed.

Edmund Burke cannot be regarded as what is called a typical Celt; but he must be taken as an example of the richness of variety which the generous soil of Ireland is capable of producing. His intellect and imagination were of the deep sea, rather than the rushing river, and the living products of it as infinite and diversified as the multitudinous genera of the ocean. In his philosophic mind he resembled Berkeley in some degree; while in the warmth and tenderness of his sympathies he was hardly the inferior of that disinterested but rather eccentric genius. A man whom one great modern authority declares fit to rank with Shakespeare, and a still greater one of a past age believed to be the superior of Cicero, is a figure which certainly sheds lustre on the country of his nativity. The purity and nobility of his private life lifted him, too, head and shoulders above the herd of prominent men in the still rough and not too squeamish age in which he flourished. In this he was truly typical of his country.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

---

DR. F. H. BRADLEY'S APPEARANCE AND REALITY  
—PRIMARY AND SECONDARY QUALITIES.

DR. BRADLEY is a metaphysician of so much distinction that his views demand careful consideration from Catholics. They do so no less on account of the truths which he defends than on account of the errors into which he has been led in common with so many other worthy men of the English Schools of Metaphysics. But most of all do his tenets and his teachings need careful consideration and criticism from English-speaking Catholics, because, in the absence of such criticism, and of every sign of esteem and appreciation on our part, we run the risk of being denied any hearing for whatever we may wish to advance on the ground of our apparent ignorance of a writer whose following, if not very numerous, is certainly a choice and distinguished following.

His last published and remarkable volume, the title of which heads this article, would demand at least as large a volume as his own, for its adequate criticism.

Our only purpose here is the very modest one of criticising his three initial chapters. Therein he at once takes up such a position that, if he cannot defend it against an assailant, will enable opponents of his who have once captured it, to disperse Dr. Bradley's metaphysical forces and put them to utter rout.

The object of his book is to show that ordinary modes of regarding the Universe—that of Catholic philosophy among the number—are delusions. He declares that the world, so understood, contradicts itself, and is therefore appearance only, and not reality—non-self-contradiction being his test of reality. His first chapter affirms that the primary qualities of objects are as much mere appearance as, in his opinion, are their secondary qualities.

His first words are :

"The fact of illusion and error is in various ways forced early upon the mind ; and the ideas, by which we try to understand the Universe, may be considered as attempts to set right our failure. In this division of my work I shall criticise some of these, and shall endeavor to show that they have not reached their object. I shall point out that the world, as so understood, contradicts itself, and is therefore appearance, and not reality."

He begins (as we have said) by criticising the proposal to make things intelligible by the distinction between primary and second-

ary qualities, because this proposal is sure to reappear, and is, he says, "in the main so easily disposed of."

The primary qualities are, he tells us, spatial, and the residue secondary, and the proposed solution (which he opposes) takes "the former as reality, and everything else somehow as derivative, and as more or less justifiable appearance."

He gives as "the foundation" of this proposed solution the following principle:

"We assume that a thing must be self-consistent and self-dependent. It either has a quality or has not got it. And if it has it, it cannot have it only sometimes, and merely in this or that relation."

That anything which exists cannot at the same time have such contradictory qualities as render existence absolutely impossible is, of course, a mere truism. But it may have qualities which are so far inconsistent that they render its continued existence ultimately impossible, and such qualities are possessed by the living bodies of men and animals.

That anything whatever (except of course God) is self-dependent is a falsism. Nothing is known to us which has not objective relations, the existence of which are absolutely necessary for its being. This is true of every mineral and non-organic substance as well as of every living creature.

It is true, indeed, of every quality that either it exists or else that it does not exist, but it is not true to say that every quality a body can have, it has always, and in every relation. Of course qualities which are essential to the existence of any kind of body or substance must be ever present, however completely hidden and unperceived they may now and again be. But there are many accidental qualities which may often be truly absent, as at other times truly present.

The quality of actually producing a glistening in human eyes, for example, which a diamond necklace possesses, is only possessed by it sometimes—when it is taken out of its case in the presence of light, and of a person, or persons, who can see it. It is merely in such relations that the quality of "actually producing a glistening in human eyes" is possessed by it. Nevertheless, that the essentially objective quality which renders it capable of producing that glistening, actually persists, we, of course, do not deny.

Mr. Bradley says<sup>1</sup> that his principle (above quoted) "is the condemnation of secondary qualities." If we are right, however, his principle is not even true. It remains to be seen whether it is, anyhow, a rational condemnation of such qualities.

<sup>1</sup> P. 12.

He says it matters very little how, in detail, this principle is worked with, and he works with it thus :

"A thing is colored, but not colored in the same way to every eye; and except to some eye it seems not colored at all."

Granting the first assertion, we demur to the second. Let a piece of *lapis lazuli* be enclosed in a dark room in which there is no living creature. Can we say that, under such conditions, it "seems not colored at all?" Certainly no man can perceive it either "colored" or "not colored;" and of course he can be sure that no "sensation of blue," such as he, or another, would have experienced, could they have seen it, can possibly exist. But that is a very different thing from saying that the piece of *lapis lazuli* "seems not colored at all." The *senses* can under such circumstances give no information whatever, but what *reason*, at least, "seems" to affirm is that the fact of not being seen, or looked at, can make no essential difference to the hidden piece of *lapis lazuli* but that every property it had, the possession of which caused an eye to see blue, remains with it still. Of course the accidental quality of "being in the act of producing a feeling of blue," as in the previous instance of the diamond necklace, will be absent when no eye sees it, but that is a very different thing from seeming "not to be colored at all." Let us suppose a lighted candle was left shut up in an empty room into which no eye looked. Is there the slightest reason for not believing that it would persist unchanged with all its properties about it, between the time the door was shut and that at which it was reopened and the lighted candle found to be still burning? That it would do so is as certain as that its incidental quality of giving light to a spectator would cease when it became shut up in the empty room. And both the piece of *lapis lazuli* and the candle must have objective properties corresponding with human feelings of "blue" and "brightness;" for if the latter depended on the observer only, why should he not cause other and very different things to appear blue and bright? I say, then, the *lapis lazuli* is colored in both cases, and is in both cases objectively blue, *i.e.*, possesses a property or properties fitted to produce in a normally constituted human being a sensation and perception of blue, and of no other color. This is not Mill's mere "permanent possibility of sensation", but a real objective quality acting on the living human body as a cause of definite sensitive effects.

"And the eye—relation to which appears somehow to make the quality—does that," he asks again, "itself possess color? Clearly not so, unless there is another eye which sees it."

But the eye does possess color, or other colors, whether seen or not—like the *lapis lazuli* shut up in the dark, but its possession of color does not in the least prevent its being actually an achromatic instrument of vision, and one which does not allow its own colors to obscure and transform the object it sees.

"Nothing therefore," he concludes, "is really colored; color seems only to belong to what itself is colorless."

On the contrary, as we are inclined to believe, everything is colored, though it may be that our sensations give us but a very faint and inadequate conception of the splendor and beauty of objective color as it might be, and may be, apprehended by other beings.<sup>1</sup> This, of course, is but a private persuasion. It is one, however, which it is impossible to prove untrue.

That the color of external objects is only perceived by what does not perceive directly its own color is but a necessary consequence of the eye being an achromatic instrument. Were it not so, every object seen would be blurred or disguised, as by looking through a figured or colored glass.

Dr. Bradley next refers to cold and heat, and by a similar argument, which may be similarly met, tries to show their unreality, contending that the skin is without them, as the eye is without color. But as the eye has color, so has the skin a definite heat; while the fact that an object of one absolute degree of temperature may here seem to us to be cold, and there be felt as warm, or first one and then the other, constitutes no tittle of evidence against that objectivity of heat which physical science affirms and acts in accordance with that affirmation.

Once more he objects:

"Sounds, not heard, are hardly real, while what *hears them is the ear*,<sup>2</sup> itself not audible, nor even always in the enjoyment of sound."

But is the cry of the bat, which A, B and C can hear, to be thought "unreal" because D is deaf to it? As to "what hears them" (*i.e.*, sounds), who can tell?

It is *we* who hear them by the aid of ears and brain. The action of both must concur, and what can be less evident than that (as Dr. Bradley implies) the brain is excluded from energizing in the act of hearing?

Next, as to smell and taste, he asks:

"If a thing tastes only in the mouth, is taste its quality? Has it smell where there is no nose?"

<sup>1</sup> See *On Truth*, p. 127.

<sup>2</sup> The italics are ours.

We reply, again, not the quality as *felt*, but the quality as *known* to the intellect to be objective (through the medium of perceived sensations) exists. Of course, the tongue does not taste itself any more than the eye sees the colors of its own tissues, or than the ear hears its own acts of audition.

As to what is "pleasant and disgusting," and as to how they can be "in the object," Beauty (like goodness and truth) is both objective and subjective<sup>1</sup>—it is not only in the mind but also in the thing the mind perceives—as, in our opinion, an intrinsic quality of an object whereby that object approximates to perfection according to the kind and sort of thing it is.

We therefore altogether deny "that things have secondary qualities only for an organ."

It is true that we may, by rare exception and under some abnormal conditions, "have the sensation without the object, and the object without the sensation;" but that does not in the least show that the sensation is not the result of the corresponding objective quality of the object, and no reasonable person can think the sensation to be a "quality" of the object, though the aptitude for producing it is.

Mr. Bradley, of course, himself accepts the truth of these contentions against the objectivity of secondary qualities, but he here treats them as part of the argument of those who say that though secondary qualities are but appearance, yet add<sup>2</sup> that "the extended only is real," and "itself has no quality but extension."

Before, however, proceeding to attack the assertion of the reality of the extended, he puts forward (for the purpose of refutation) an imagined defence of secondary qualities (something on our own lines), as follows:

"All the arguments do but show defect in, or interference with, the organ of perception. . . . The qualities are constant in the things themselves, and if they fail to impart themselves, or impart themselves wrongly, that is always due to something outside their nature. If we could perceive them, they are there,"

This defence seems to him "hardly tenable," because, "if the qualities impart themselves never except under conditions, how in the end are we to say what they are when unconditioned?" But the "qualities" never exist "unconditioned." The antithesis is between "under conditions of one sort" and "under conditions of another sort"; and if our sensations are only evoked under the first set of conditions, how can we pretend to say what their results would be under an absolutely unexperienced second set of conditions? But because we may not be able to tell what those results might be, that fact in no way invalidates our perception

<sup>1</sup> See *On Truth*, p. 257.

<sup>2</sup> P. 13.

that there *are* objective qualities which the first set of conditions reveals the existence of to us through the sensations they give rise to. The fact that these qualities are always made known to us through related sensations which are only known as "appearing," does not in the least show that we know these qualities are only appearances, though, as we all agree, we know them only *through* sensations which present themselves in "consentience"<sup>1</sup> or in consciousness.

That a taste, or smell, may be partly pleasant and partly disgusting<sup>2</sup> is nothing wonderful as the result of previous sensuous associations of different kinds. Such feelings have no necessarily corresponding objective characteristics. We all know that tastes differ,<sup>3</sup> and no one is so foolish as to suppose that if the flavor of cinnamon is disgusting to him (as it happens to be to us) it must also be disgusting to other people.

Therefore we altogether deny that the defence of secondary qualities has broken down.

Dr. Bradley then proceeds to examine the question, Are secondary qualities but the appearance of the primary qualities, and are these latter "the reality?" He raises four objections against their reality.

As the first of these objections he asks:<sup>4</sup>

"How, in the nature of the extended, the qualities stand to the relations which have to hold between them?"

But in order to affirm with certainty that the extended exists (that in its parts are external to each other), it is by no means necessary to pretend to know its "nature" and how the "qualities" and "relations" stand to each other. The absolute, essential nature of bodies—corporeal substance in itself—certainly is not known, nor do we believe it ever will be. "Qualities" and "relations," as such, are, of course, mere "abstractions," though they have a foundation in the several realities of which they are predicated. The difficulties here raised by Dr. Bradley are mainly verbal, and result from the impossibility of using language not based on the imagination, and the correlative impossibility of our imagining anything which has not (as a whole or in its parts) been the subject of sensuous experience.

Dr. Bradley's expressions "stand" and "to hold between" have, of course, plainly sensuous implications which tend utterly to mislead. They suggest "qualities" existing, as if they were a "series of posts," with "chains of relations" holding between them.

<sup>1</sup> As to this term, see *On Truth*, p. 183.

<sup>2</sup> P. 14.

<sup>3</sup> See *On Truth*, p. 260, and *Essays and Criticisms*.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 14, 15, and also p. 38.

But objective "relations" and objective "qualities" are not like chains or posts or any other material things, but are often necessarily and absolutely unimaginable by us. Our impotence to imagine them, however, is not the slightest bar to our apprehending them by the intellect, while if we *could* imagine them, our very power so to do would, *ipso facto*, prove that we were under the grossest error concerning them.

Dr. Bradley's second objection is that—

"the relation of the primary qualities to the secondary—in which class feeling and thought have presumably to be placed—seem wholly unintelligible. For nothing is actually removed from existence by being labelled 'appearance.'"

Put the word "unimaginable" for "unintelligible," and we freely grant the truth of the first sentence just quoted. Each of us has an extended body with feelings and thoughts, the whole constituting, during life, an absolute indivisible unity, though embracing many relations. But what man convinced of this would pretend (if out of Bedlam) to be able to correctly imagine such relations? The avowal of the impotence of the imagination, however, need not be accompanied by the faintest doubt about their existence and reality. And though "appearances" have a certain reality as such, there are various orders of reality, and the reality of appearances is very different from the reality of an oak tree, a coat, or of the individual who may wear it.

Dr. Bradley further says:<sup>1</sup>

"Appearance must belong, and yet cannot belong, to the extended."

But why must it so belong, and why cannot it in another way belong thereto? The double operation is, for us, by no means evident. That everything extended is apparent is hardly less false than the assertion that nothing extended can be apparent.

Again we read :

"Appearance is neither able to fall somewhere apart, since there is no other real place; nor ought it, since, if so, the relation would vanish and appearance would cease to be derivative."

Dr. Bradley is exceedingly apt to make use of such very material images as "falling outside" and "somewhere apart," etc. But such images are exceedingly misleading, and, we venture to think, mislead Dr. Bradley himself. Still, as in the above-quoted words, he is representing the views of a supposed asserter of the *exclusive* reality of primary qualities, we will let his statement pass.

Once more he observes :

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 15.

"But on the other side, if it belongs in any sense to the reality, how can it be shown not to infect that with its own unreal character?"

But appearance may (and we believe does) belong to the reality in so far as the reality has qualities which occasion us to apprehend such appearance, and this in no way even tends to cast doubt upon the reality itself.

He goes on :

"Or we may urge that matter must cease to be itself, if qualified essentially by all that is secondary. But taken otherwise, it has become itself but one out of two elements, and is not the reality."

We are afraid that we do not understand Dr. Bradley in this sentence. It is, of course, quite plain that each parcel of matter cannot be essentially qualified by *all* that is secondary (*e.g.*, be black and not black, noisy and silent, sapid and tasteless) at the same time. What need can there be to suppose it so qualified in order to affirm the objectivity of something extended?

But surely it is conceivable, for it was for ages so taught and believed, and by very many it is still believed, that matter, *materia prima*, has no qualities in itself, but may successively receive a variety of very different ones. If Dr. Bradley by the expression "taken otherwise" means devoid of all qualities, he may be quite right, for such matter would be *materia prima*, often termed a *quasi-nihil*. If, however, by "taken otherwise" he means (as he would seem to express) *not* qualified essentially by all that is secondary, that is just what every body and substance that we know of is, and being so, *is* a reality.

His third contention is that the reasoning which (according to him) shows secondary qualities not to be real, equally serves to show that primary qualities are not real either.

He says :

"The extended comes to us only by relation to an organ ; the thing is perceived by us through an affection of our body, and never without that."

But why in the world should we not apprehend extension through our organs, and what doubt does such a means of apprehending it cast upon the truth of the apprehension? Why, also, should we be uncertain as to truths of our perception of the extension (*e.g.*, of our own body) if we can only perceive it by the action of one part on another? Are we to reject everything as uncertain at which we arrive by the use of our organs, and to consider as certain only that at which we have no means of arriving whatever? He says:<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. 15.

"That we have no miraculous intuition of our body, as spatial reality is perfectly certain."

The word "miraculous" is needless and should be eliminated, as its only use can be to excite an irrational prejudice. Nobody pretends that we have a miraculous intuition of any kind.

But *quod gratis asseritur gratis negatur*, and we do not hesitate to affirm that our intuition of our body as a substantial reality is perfectly certain.

Of course as we cannot think till we have begun to feel, our intuition of the body's extension is not gained without experience. But the ordinary experience of life makes that intuition clear and distinct at a very early date.

Dr. Bradley imagines a defence of extension against himself, thus:<sup>1</sup>

"We might reply that the extended thing is a fact real of itself, and that only its relation to our percipience is variable."

But this defence he attacks as follows:

"If a thing is known to have a quality only under a certain condition, there is no process of reasoning from this which will justify the conclusion that the thing, if unconditioned, is still the same. This seems quite certain."

Again we must correct the expression "unconditioned." Once more the antithesis is between "some conditions" and "other conditions;" and so corrected the assertion is plainly erroneous. We have only known the sun in so far as it is above the horizon. But that does not prevent one being certain that we could, were we supplied with the means, also see it on the opposite side of the heavens.

Dr. Bradley further says:

"If we have no other source of information, if the quality in question is non-existent for us except in one relation, then for us to assert its reality away from that relation is more than unwarranted."

But we always have more than one source of information about the qualities of objects. We have (1) consentience and (2) the self-conscious intellect. To take the simplest case; the perception of the odor of a rose. We have our sense of smell and its product, the sensation of the rose. But we have also the intellect which reveals to us that sensation as being due to an objective quality possessed by that flower.

There is thus a certain *vraisemblance* in Dr. Bradley's remark, that if we validly apprehend extended bodies we—

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 16.

"must somehow get to the existence of primary qualities in a way which avoids their relation to an organ,"

The real meaning of this appears to be that we must not only *feel* but also *know*, and this we also loudly assert. The complexus of bodily sensations united with the imagination of past sensuous associated experiences, suffices for our sense-apprehension of the extended, and thus the active intellect raises to a direct and immediate perception thereof.

His next argument is that :

"Without secondary quality, extension is not conceivable, and no one can bring it, as existing before the mind if he keeps it quite pure."

To attempt to do so, he says, is to take a ghost for a solid reality.

But here we have again a result of the error of limiting the power of the intellect to the imaginative faculty. Of course we cannot think of anything extended without imagining secondary quality because we have never once in our lives experienced anything extended without secondary quality.

He next says<sup>1</sup> that the doctrine he opposes—

"of course, holds that the extended can be natural, entirely apart from every other quality. But extension is never so given. If it is visual, it must be colored, and if it is natural, or acquired in the various other ways which may fall under the head of the 'muscular sense'—then it is never free from sensations, coming from the skin, or the joints, or the muscles, or as some would like to add, from a central source."

Now to us it is certainly not evident that the extended can be actual entirely apart from any other quality, neither is it evident that it cannot so be actual. But this, of course, does not even tend to invalidate the reality of the extended. Of course it is never so given; of course it is given in company with sensations, for we can perceive nothing save *through* their aid. It is also most true, indeed we have always asserted, that no one can think of extension save by the aid of a mental image of something extended. Dr. Bradley says, "without thinking at the same time of a 'what' that is extended," and this with particular differences "up and down" also included.

After observing that some psychologists urge that primary qualities are derived from secondary, which he (Dr. Bradley) "could not quite say," he adds, "Extension cannot be presented or thought of, except as one with quality that is secondary." This assertion is manifestly false. We cannot think of extension without the help of the sensuous images, but thus aided, we *can*

think of it as apart from secondary quality. For if we could not do so, we could not discuss the question whether or not it can so exist, neither could we have declared, as we have done, that to us it is not evident that it can do so. Neither could Dr. Bradley write upon the question as he does. Surely he would not contend that he writes about a question concerning which he is utterly unable to think.

"Extension" is an abstraction, as also is "quality," whether primary or secondary; but like them, with a foundation in actually existing concrete things.

Dr. Bradley, again, imagines a reply to himself to the effect that "secondary qualities" are "results from the primary." But this is by no means our explanation. We have no pretension to explain *how* anything extended exists, or how it possesses in the concrete what we describe by the abstract term "secondary qualities." But *ignorantia modi non tollit certitudinem facti*.

It is certainly true that if in scientific work we find it convenient to disregard certain aspects of things and go on thence to infer that the residue regarded is an independent, real thing, apart from what we have disregarded, such an inference would indeed be "barbarous metaphysics." No doubt, also, if we became convinced that there was nothing real and objective in secondary qualities, such scepticism might weaken our intellectual perception of the extended as such; but the reality of the latter is not an inference but an intellectual intuition acquired through the ministry of sense. Thus, Dr. Bradley, unless we are strangely mistaken, has neither succeeded in showing that primary qualities stand on the same footing as secondary ones, nor that the latter are appearances only and not known to us as so many external realities. But if neither primary nor secondary qualities are mere appearances, he is mistaken with respect to his inquiry into the initial stages of mere delusion. Now, a mistake so fundamental is surely enough to deprive of certitude all Dr. Bradley's subsequent reasonings.

Before proceeding to consider Dr. Bradley's second chapter, it may be well to note how idealism must be the irresistible result of a refusal to Reason of its natural rights.

The man who knows nothing of metaphysics sees a tree, a dog, or a stone, and declares he sees them. If asked how he knows he does see them, he replies he sees them, and, if he likes, can feel them. An idealist tells him he can really know nothing but his sensations and groups of imaginations of passed sensations, and that his tree, dog and stone are each but complex groups of sensations and imaginations, together with perceptions of such groups, which are all nothing but so many psychical states. Try as he may, he cannot see, feel, or in any way become cognizant of any-

thing save some feelings or psychical states. So says the idealist; and many a plain man may be thereby converted to idealism, or may at least be puzzled and find no answer. But a man of sturdy good sense and some acuteness may, however, reply to the idealist thus: You may talk for ever, but I know that the tree, dog and stone are in themselves something over and above and apart from any psychical states of mine or of yours, though the three objects are made present to both our minds thereby.

And the sturdy-minded man is right; for he unconsciously recognizes what the idealist ignores, namely, the intuitive action of the intellect. "Feelings" vivid and faint, however complexly grouped, can know nothing; it is only by the intellect a man can know that he even has feelings, and that very intellect which tells him he has "feelings" tells him also of the presence of the tree, the dog and the stone, and also of his own body, as real, objective, and not merely psychical. To regard the "feelings" experienced as more certain or real than the perception of objects is, indeed, to put the cart before the horse. Objects are perceived and apprehended first and directly; the feelings through which we perceive them we can only recognize afterwards, indirectly (with more or less troublesome effort) through reflexion.

We do not, of course, wish to imply that "Idealists" are habitually occupied about their "feelings" more than other people, or that they fail to recognize things perceived as perceived. Nevertheless they declare that the things so perceived are psychical states—are mental—and so sacrifice the primary declaration of their reason to secondary inferences.

If a man will persist in regarding his sensations instead of his intellect as supreme, and in disregarding the direct declarations of the latter, he is thereby forced to construct, if he would systematize his knowledge, some artificial world of feelings, and the various systems of idealism are the inevitable results. They result necessarily from ignoring what our reason tells us about the external world, and only accepting as positive the materials whereby our reason is enabled to perceive anything. Their idealistic conceptions are like the movements which a blind man, only guided by his stick, has to make, as contrasted with the free and unconstrained progression of him who has his eyes open and uses them, which are like the conceptions of a non-idealist.

We are so organized that our reason has first to be awakened through the incidence of sensations, while all our intellectual acts have to be aided by sensuous imaginations. The result is that he who neglects to note that they cannot (however useful or indispensable) be *known* without the use of the intellect, unconsciously destroys the basis of every system he would rear on a

basis of feelings, for those feelings cannot be known save by that very power which apprehends objectivities beyond sensation and the realities of the external world; and if he regards its declarations as to these to be untrustworthy, what reason has he to trust its declarations as to the nature of his psychical states? That he has what he believes to be such is, of course, absolutely unquestionable, but that they are feelings or psychical states and nothing more he can never by any possibility know. All beyond what he knows as his present feelings must be for him an impenetrable mystery, while the fact that he "knows it," and knows it not through feeling but through the declarations of his intellect, ought to make him recognize the fact of the inexpressible inferiority of all sensations and sense-impressions to that power through which he knows that he has them. It is as difficult, mysterious, and wonderful to know a "sense-impression" as to know any object of the external world which our intellect can perceive through its presence.

But in fact, though such object can be perceived with absolute certainty, all that is *most* certain is made up of what the senses can never take cognizance of or be impressed by.

That we do no injustice to Dr. Bradley in asserting that for him everything is mental, the following words<sup>1</sup> prove: "We can discover nothing that is not either feeling or thought, or will or emotion, or something else of the kind. We can find nothing but this, and to have an idea of anything else is plainly impossible." This he assumes as a main principle clearly established, and his only effort is to develop it and free it from obscurities<sup>2</sup>—an effort vain indeed.

We may study Dr. Bradley's second and third chapters together, for they are expositions of one conception, or rather, we fear, of one misconception. They together constitute a marvellous and very interesting manifestation of the hopeless confusion and irrationality, as it seems to us, which necessarily results from treating mental states as the be all and end all of existence.

One very curious feature the reader may remark in Dr. Bradley's idealism, and that is his fundamental materialism and utter subjection to the very crudest sensuous images, taken as valid representations and tests of intellectual conceptions.

His second chapter (p. 19) is entitled "*Substantive and Adjective*," while his third (p. 25) is headed "*Relation and Quality*."

He begins his curiously gratuitous puzzle by observing: "We find the world's contents grouped into things and their qualities;" adding: "I must briefly point out the failure of this method, if regarded as a serious attempt at reality."

<sup>1</sup> P. 522.

<sup>2</sup> P. 523.

He selects as a familiar instance of a thing and its qualities a lump of sugar, whereof white, hard and sweet are properties or adjectives which qualify it.

Out of this simple idea or perception he then proceeds to evolve most amazing puzzles. To begin with, he says: "The sugar, we say, *is* all that; but what the *is* can really mean seems doubtful. A thing is not one of its qualities, if you take that quality by itself; if 'sweet' were the same as 'simply sweet,' the thing would clearly be not sweet."

We are by no means sure that every reader of this will at once "clearly" see what Dr. Bradley means by the last part of the above sentence. Its meaning we take to be as follows: A thing "simply sweet" would be nothing but sweet, it would have no quality but sweetness. Now, the lump of sugar has other qualities, and therefore cannot be "simply sweet." If, therefore, sweet were identical with "simply sweet," as it cannot be this (*i.e.*, simply sweet), it cannot be that the latter is identical with, namely, sweet. After this example of Dr. Bradley's love of verbal paradox, and noting, in passing, the impossibility of anything being "simply sweet," let us consider the initial puzzle of his sentence—the puzzle, namely, that the sugar *is* white, hard and sweet.

It is certainly true that a thing is neither one of its qualities nor all its qualities combined, and yet it is true that this lump of sugar *is in reality* white, as well as sweet and hard also.

Not, of course, that the concrete substance sugar is the same thing as the abstraction white, but that the substance *really is in itself* of such a nature, objectively and in the concrete, as to produce in us real, concrete feelings, which we denote by the abstract terms white, sweet, and hard.

It is quite true, as Dr. Bradley remarks, that the sugar cannot be all its properties taken severally. As he also most rightly says, "Sugar is obviously not mere whiteness, mere hardness, and mere sweetness, for its reality lies somehow in its unity."

There is, of course, the very essence of the sugar, its corporeal, material substance. To this, however, Dr. Bradley, equally, of course, remains altogether blind. Thus he continues: "If we inquire what there can be in the thing besides its several qualities, we are baffled once more. We can discover no real unity existing outside these qualities, or, again, existing within them."

None, proverbially, are so blind as those who will not see; and Dr. Bradley persists in keeping his intellectual eyes closed with a firm will.

Though we can discover no reality existing "outside" or "inside" (the reader should note these material images), the qualities, the normal human intellect can, without any difficulty, discover

and apprehend a substantial objective reality, which is one with its various objective qualities, the subjective effects of which are corresponding qualities of the mind affected by them.

When the essence, the whole substantial reality, is ideally removed (as our author removes it) from our object—a lump of sugar, or an idealist philosopher—it is easy to play fast and loose, or make ducks and drakes, ideally, of unfortunate “qualities” and “relations” which cannot pretend to any self-subsistence in themselves, and seem thus cast loose to be the sport of any wind of doctrine, and even blown into “cocked-hats,” so that they would not know themselves had they any mind wherewith to know anything.

Our author next proposes (with a view to showing its futility) to arrive at some satisfactory solution by the interposition of relations.

As to sweet, white and hard, he says (p. 20): “We certainly do not predicate one of the other, for, if we attempt to identify them, they at once resist.” But in truth they do nothing of the kind, nor anything at all, but remain purely quiescent, as becomes mere abstractions, whose business is not “to do” but “to be done with” by human intelligence, which recognizes them for what they are, and clearly sees that, in forming the abstract idea “white,” it has acted in one way, and in forming the abstractions “sweet” and “hard” it has acted in two other ways—as a collector who collects fish, insects and plants acts differently with each. The difference of action, however, which attends the actions of the abstractor or collector are differences caused by the objective natures of the kinds of qualities abstracted, and of three kinds of objects collected. The three acts of abstraction in themselves and the three acts of collection in themselves are severally similar, and the abstractor knows that the three objects of his process of abstraction are distinct and different in themselves, as the collector knows his fishes are not insects, nor his insects plants.

But Dr. Bradley asks (ironically) why should sugar “be more than its properties in relation? When ‘white,’ ‘hard’ and ‘sweet,’ and the rest coexist in a certain way, that is surely the secret of the thing. The qualities are and were in relation.”

Supposing, then, that a relation is to be asserted in a case. “The quality A is in relation with another quality, B. But what are we to understand here by *is*? We do not mean that in relation with B is A, and yet we assert that A *is* in relation with B.”

Surely we have here a most notable instance of perversity as to a mere word, the word “is,” which Dr. Bradley (making a difficulty where there really is none) affects not to see is used in two utterly different senses in his suggestions. In one sense it is used to predicate identity, as when we say A is A; in the other case

it affirms not at all identity, but the mere existence of a circumstance or condition.

Thus, when we say (as above quoted), "one quality A is in relation with another quality, B," what we are to understand by "is" is the affirmation of a circumstance or condition affecting both A and B. No man in his senses could suppose that "is," as here used, signifies either that "'in relation with B'" (words which are gibberish and denote nothing) "is identical with A," or that "A is identical with 'in relation with B,'" which Dr. Bradley puts forward as results of regarding qualities as existing in relation or of asserting a relation of each of the qualities, sweet, white and hard.

Then he continues: "In the same way C is called 'before D,' and E is spoken of as *being* 'to the right of F.' We say all this, but from the interpretation, then 'before D' *is* C, and 'to the right of F' is E, we recoil in horror." Here we have a confusion between (1) "is" as predicating existence, (2) "is" as affirming first an antecedent condition in time, and (3) "is" as asserting a particular position in space. The inverted commas and the order of the words are wrongly placed, and so necessarily convey a false signification. They should be thus: C "is before" D, and E "is to the right of" F. This simple change caused Dr. Bradley's verbal paradoxes to vanish like so many enchantments conjured up by a logomachian magician.

He next proposes to substitute "has" for "is," and to assert the relation not of one term but of two, as "a sort of attribute which adheres or belongs" to the things related.

Then he presents us once more with a profound puzzle out of nothing, saying: "If you mean that A and B, taken each severally, even 'have' this relation, you are asserting what is false. But if you mean that A and B in such a relation are so related, you appear to mean nothing."

Let us suppose that two persons belong to the same family, being descendants of the same great-grandfather. Each of them, taken severally, "has" this relationship, and to so affirm is not false. Of course if the phrase "taken severally" is used to mean that the existence of one of the pair is absolutely unknown, then, of course, X, who only knows of one, cannot assert, with subjective truth, the relationship of one person to another of whose existence X knows absolutely nothing. But that would not destroy the *objective* truth of such a statement made by a man who foolishly or unconsciously asserts it. On the other hand, to say that two family relations, A and B, are related in blood does not "mean nothing," but is tautology.

Dr. Bradley continues (p. 21) as follows: "But let us attempt

another exit from this bewildering circle. Let us abstain from making the relation an attribute of the related, and let us make it more or less independent."

The "bewildering circle" is of Dr. Bradley's own creation, and bewilders and encircles no one but those who adopt his "bewildering" philosophy. His hypothetical suggestion of regarding a relation as something distinct from the things related involves, as it must, and as he shows it does, a *regressus ad infinitum*. For if a relation between two things were independently real and distinct and separate from both these, two other relations would be required to connect that relation with the things related (one for each), and so on forever.

He next says (pp. 21-22): "The attempt to resolve the thing into properties, each a real thing, taken somehow together with independent relations, has proved an obvious failure. 'A relation,' if it is to be real, must be so somehow at the expense of the terms, or, at least, must be something which appears in them or to which they belong."

But a relation is in no way "at the expense of the terms." The relation of consanguinity between two brothers is an abstract idea, which idea while present in a mind is a subjective fact as real as any brickbat, while the abstraction refers to a real objective fact concerning each of the brothers, and concerning both of them, and also their parents, which objective fact is the foundation of the abstract idea.

Similarly a spatial relation, or a relation of time between two objects or events, are of course each of them *as* relations abstract ideas (as no one knows better than Dr. Bradley), but they are derived from objective facts of position or succession between such objects or events.

"A relation between *A* and *B*," he tells us, "implies really a substantial foundation between them." "A substantial foundation between them" is an odd way of expressing that one loaf of bread is two days older than another, though, of course, a series of real events took place between the completion of the process of baking each of the two loaves. He explains (or tries to) his meaning, saying: "This foundation, if we say that *A* is like *B*, is the identity *X*, which holds these differences together." But granting, for argument's sake, that "likeness" implies some fragmentary identity between two objects, how are they necessarily held together thereby? There is a certain "likeness" between the Arctic and the Antarctic regions, but it is not that which holds them together; and if the "likeness" which exists between certain comets holds them together, it must be said to hold them with a singularly untenacious and elastic grasp.

He next suggests an explanation which he also regards (and no wonder) as unsatisfactory. It is the suggestion that anything real which has different qualities, preserves them in existence by giving rise to relations between them. His words are (p. 22): "It seems as if a reality possessed differences, A and B, incompatible with one another, and also with itself. And so in order, without contradiction, to retain its various properties, this whole consents to wear the form of relations between them. And this is why qualities are found to be some incompatible and some compatible."

As to what is "contrary," he says it is where a thing fails to set up a relation between its properties. Thus, an odor is not contrary to a color because a relation can be established between them, but two colors are contrary because no relation can be established between them.

Yet we still have our shot-silks after all, while the relations which exist between colors and smells are not very evident.

However, we may abstain from further criticism here, since Dr. Bradley himself tells us (p. 23): "The whole device is a mere makeshift. It consists in saying to the outside world, 'I am the owner of these my adjectives;' and to the properties, 'I am but a relation which leaves you your liberty.' And to itself and for itself it is the futile pretence to have both characters at once."

Not consenting to recognize an object as naturally apprehended, its properties inevitably seem to him to "fall apart from the thing and away from one another," while "no unity is possible save through the old undivided substance." This substance he objects to, because, he says, it "admits of no distinctions."

Yet this seems to us to be a huge mistake. We have, of course, no perception of corporeal substance in itself, but distinctions between concrete substances of different kinds and between different properties of the same concrete substance are quite clearly apprehensible by us through the combined action of our reason and our senses.

Dr. Bradley concludes his second chapter by bringing forward another possible suggestion, the suggestion, namely, that the thing perceived itself is a unity, and its aspects "of adjective and substantive" are only subjective points of view. But to accept this would be to abandon the whole matter which Dr. Bradley's book is intended to investigate, namely, how, without error (p. 24), "we may think of reality." It also doubles the confusion by adding a positive assertion of mental incapacity to apprehend the real to previously noted difficulties.

His third chapter begins with a consideration of the respective natures of "quality" and "relation," and he affirms that anything,

the facts as to which are arranged into the two groups, "relations" and "qualities," is "not true reality, but is appearance."

The author avows that the object of his third chapter is to show that the very essence of the ideas "relation" and "quality" contradicts itself.

Dr. Bradley's test of reality is non-self-contradiction, as he conceives of it, and, of course, we fully agree with him, that what contradicts itself cannot be reality.

He tells us (p. 25) his conclusion will be that "relation presupposes quality, and quality relation."

His first contention is, that qualities are nothing without relations. He need surely contend but little on this head, if we were to grant his assumption that qualities and relations are nothing but feelings—nothing but psychical states. Were such the case, he would, indeed, be right in his contention, and our intellects would all exist in that state of hopeless muddle wherein he takes them to be.

He says (p. 26): "You can never find qualities without relations. Whenever you take them so, they are made so, and continue so, which itself implies relation." Of course, we cannot perceive a quality without an act of perception, and without distinguishing it from what has not that quality and, very often, from other qualities also, and all this most truly implies relations between that quality and our mind and between our ideas of what has and what has not such quality. We cannot, of course, think without thinking, or think of A and B without A and B coming into relation in our mind. All this is surely nothing but the most obvious of truisms.

He admits the existence of unrelated qualities in the form of mere feelings with several aspects, merely felt and not perceived by him who feels. But these, he affirms (p. 27), are not qualities at all, save to an outside observer, and for such an observer they must be also relations, or he could not cognize them as *aspects*.

For us, of course, such mere feelings, even when perceived by no outside observer any more than by the subject of them, are none the less true objective qualities of the psychical being which feels them, and they have also objective relations with whatever causes or conditions their existence.

Dr. Bradley next suggests an answer to his own paradox, to the effect that though there may be a relation between qualities, and any mind which perceives them, yet this "relation does not really belong to reality"; it only exists for us, and is a condition of our knowledge. But the distinction between quality and relation is none the less based upon differences in the only real thing, which differences persist when we are no longer apprehending that

thing. This answer is fundamentally similar to our own, and we regard it as sound and valid.

Dr. Bradley repudiates it as follows: "Such an answer depends on the separation of product from process, and this separation seems indefensible. The qualities, as distinct, are always made so by an action which is admitted to imply relation."

But we, of course, altogether deny that qualities are products of our mental activity, or of any imaginable mental activity, with the exception of those mental qualities which have been elaborated by the mental labor of those who possess them.

The quality of rotundity which exists in a child's marble exists independently of (as before said) any imaginable mind.

But of course you cannot separate product from process if there is no product which is not mental and the outcome of a mental process. Such qualities when recognized as distinct must of course be made so to the mind "by an action" which implies "relation."

Dr. Bradley considers the objection that the process may not, after all, be essential to the product, adding, "that is a conclusion to be proved, and it is monstrous to assume it." And most truly monstrous it would be had we no knowledge of qualities altogether independent of any imaginable mind.

"Not only" he further (p. 28) observes, "is the ignoring of the process a thing quite indefensible, but there is evidence that it gives falsehood. For the result bears internally the character of the process. The manyness of the qualities cannot, in short, be reconciled with their simplicity. Their plurality depends on relation, and without that relation, they are not distinct. But, if not distinct, then not different, and therefore not qualities."

This is of course most true, too; distinct qualities must be different, and if different, distinct, and if distinct, then related, and if related, then more than unity. This may seem mere trifling to our readers; but it is only by such a method that we can (so far as we see) bring home to them the fact that every system, such as that of Dr. Bradley, must be constructed of blended truisms and paradoxes, and nothing else.

But our author does not deny "that quality without difference is in every sense impossible." "Creatures might," he says, exist whose whole life for themselves consisted of "one unbroken simple feeling." But this he regards as irrelevant, since "a universe confined to our feelings would not only not be qualities, but it would fail even to be one quality, as different from others and as distinct from relations." Such would most certainly be the case could such an utter absurdity be for a moment deemed to be even a possibility.

Dr. Bradley next says (p. 29), "that any separateness implies separation, and so relation, and is therefore, when made absolute, a self-discrepancy. For consider, the qualities A and B are to be different from each other; and if so, that difference must fall somewhere. If it falls in any degree or to any extent outside A and B, we have a relation at once. But, on the other hand, how can difference and otherness fall inside? If we have in A any such otherness, then inside A we must distinguish its own quality and its otherness. And, if so, then the unsolved problem breaks out inside each quality, and separates each into two qualities in relation. In brief, diversity without relation seems a word without meaning."

Very curious, we must once more remark, is this materialistic symbolism of a difference falling outside or inside as if it were a spent bullet. If as, as we shall shortly see, there may be differences which, seen in a certain sense, are unrelated; yet of course for Idealists, a difference cannot exist, cannot be thought of, without a relation. Thus Dr. Bradley naturally asks: "Is it possible to think of distinct characters without some relation between them, either explicit, or else unconsciously supplied by the mind that tries only to apprehend? Have qualities without relation any meaning for thought? For myself, I am sure that they have none;" and so are we sure also.

Having thus come to the conclusion that qualities taken *without relations*, have no intelligible meaning, Dr. Bradley proceeds to the second part of his contention (p. 30, No. 2) which is that they are equally devoid of intelligible meaning when taken *with relation*.

He says, truly enough, that qualities cannot "be wholly resolved into relations," and declares that any such assertion as that "relations can somehow make the terms which are related," is to him (as it is also to us) "quite unintelligible." So far as I can see, relations must depend upon terms, just as much as terms upon relations.

To us the existence of quality and relation presents no difficulty. Let us take the simple example of broiled ham and our sensitive body. The ham has a certain objective quality, and we possess another and very different one (namely, an objective organization capable of giving rise, under circumstances, to different gustatory feelings), while a very evident relation exists between the two. But that relation neither adds to, divides, nor embarrasses our perception of either of the two qualities themselves. Each exists in its own objective independence, while the relation, to borrow Dr. Bradley's language, "falls outside the former and inside the latter," for the taste perceived in no way affects the objective quality re-

ferred to of the ham tasted, while nothing can be more sure than that it affects us. Similarly, the two objective qualities of the sun and earth, which result in the annual revolution of the latter round the former, in no way depend on the latter relation for their existence.

Dr. Bradley says (p. 31), that since the qualities must both *be* and be *related*, a diversity arises "which falls inside each quality." Each quality "has a double character, as both supporting and as being made by the relation;" the same must be affirmed of each part of that double character, and so on *ad infinitum*. "Hence the quality must exchange its unity for an internal relation. But, thus set free, the diversè aspects, because each something in relation must each be something also beyond [*sic*]. This diversity is fatal to the internal unity of each, and it demands a new relation, and so without limit. In short, qualities in a relation have turned out as unintelligible as even qualities without one. The problem from both sides has baffled us."

Surely, such a result might suffice to prove to most sane thinkers that the system which inevitably leads to such a result must be a false one.

He then (p. 32, No. 3) proceeds to show that, similarly, "relations" are unintelligible, either with or without their qualities.

Since relations for him are thoughts, while nothing is more, relations are, as we before remarked,<sup>1</sup> as substantial and solid in his system as the iron links of any chain; but we gladly quote his declaration (in defiance of other irrational systems), that relations without things related are for him nothing. He says: "For myself, a relation which somehow precipitates terms which were not there before, or a relation which compel us somehow without terms, and with no differences beyond the mere ends of a line of connection, is really a phrase without meaning."

Endless and hopeless, indeed, is the confusion which attends "relations" according to Bradley's system. A relation cannot be the mere adjective of either of two related terms or of both taken apart, for then it could not connect, while, if it belongs to both, he asks, "What keeps them apart?" And such a question may consistently enough be asked of a world of mere thoughts, but in a world of realities, such as we know to exist, a relation may very well belong to two related things which are otherwise kept very distinctly apart. On the other hand, if relations are nothing but thoughts the confusion becomes really inextricable. If the relation is nothing to the qualities they thereby cease to be related, and so (as before shown) cease to be qualities. But if the relation is to be something to these qualities, then we require a new connecting

<sup>1</sup> See *Ante*, p. 9.

relation, and as so, *ad infinitum*, as he showed before in another connection.<sup>1</sup> He says (p. 33): "The links are united by a link, and this bond of union is a link which also has two ends; and these require each a fresh link to connect them with the old. . . . If you take the connection as a solid thing, you have got to show, and you cannot show, how the other solids are joined to it. And, if you take it as a kind of medium, or unsubstantial atmosphere, it is a connection no longer."

Very curious, once more, is this extremely material imagery and the notion that a relation can be more satisfactory when imaged forth as a solid than when imaged as a gaseous substance!

As our author says, it would be profitless to proceed farther with these arguments, though to have proceeded so far, has been, we think, necessary in order to give the reader any clear idea of Dr. Bradley's position.

The conclusion he arrives at is that a mode of thought which makes use of such conceptions as relations and their terms, or qualities, necessarily affords us only what is mere appearance and not truth.

He recognizes the natural impulse and the unaccountableness of our regarding the universe as made up of parts having various qualities and relations. Through sane metaphysics this impulse is seen to be rational and is justified satisfactorily by its results. But such cannot be the case for one who regards the universe as an all-embracing absolute, which is experience, or something whereof thought may at least be considered as a symbol.

Pathetic are the words wherein in his "Logic" he expresses the conclusions at which he had then arrived. They are (in his Preface, p. vii.): "On all questions, if you push me far enough, at present I end in doubts and perplexities. And on this account, at least, no lover of metaphysics will judge me hardly, perhaps . . . if I saw further I should be simpler."

His present work, "Appearance and Reality," is devoted to the task of representing that there is but one reality, the absolute, whereof whatever exists, and is apprehensible by us, is but a mode, and that it is impossible to establish any real distinction, whether of quality, relation, or anything else. That such distinctions really and objectively exist is for some philosophy absolutely certain and evident, but for Dr. Bradley<sup>2</sup> the acceptance of such evidence only shows that our intellect has been condemned to confusion and bankruptcy, and that "the reality has been left outside uncomprehended."

Our brief review may, we think, suffice to introduce our readers to Dr. Bradley's style and system, because he himself expressly

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 21, 22.

<sup>2</sup> P. 34.

declares that his third chapter, if its principles have been grasped, serves as a complete introduction to his whole work. That work, however, is replete with curious problems concerning thought and reality, error and evil, body and soul, and, above all, about the Absolute. With the Absolute, evil is declared to be in no sense incompatible, while goodness "is a one-sided, inconsistent aspect of perfection." The Absolute both is and is not good, while as to its happiness we are told it somehow possesses and enjoys that balance of pleasure and pain which exists in the universe and may be pleasant. To some of these questions as treated by Dr. Bradley we may hereafter return, should such a return be found hereafter desirable.

ST. GEORGE MIVART.

---

### ST. CYPRIAN AND THE HOLY SEE.

CYPRIAN: HIS LIFE, HIS TIMES, HIS WORK. BY *Edward White Benson*, D.D., D.C.L., sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

S. CYPRIANI, OPERA OMNIA. W. Hartel. Vienna: 1868-1871.

TREATISES OF ST. CYPRIAN. Oxford Translation. Oxford: 1839.

ENDING his labor of thirty years, on Sunday, March 22, 1896, the late Archbishop wrote, "I pray God bless this Cyprian to the good of His Church. If He bless it not, I have spent half my life in building hay and stubble, and the fire must consume it. But please God, may it last." Pathetic words, to receive a certain melancholy tinge from the event of that other Sunday, when he who set them down, falling forward in his seat at Hawarden while the service was going quietly through its appointed course, left his place and his argument to a new generation. There are not many things that last in this world; and by the nature of the case polemical writings, though ever so famous for a while, are liable to be forgotten as fresh points of dispute or argument rise into prominence with the change of seasons. If such volumes are studied long after the day when they come forth—as Bossuet's "Variations," or Butler's "Analogy," or Newman's "Development of Christian Doctrine,"—the reason will be

found in their successful dealing with a view or a principle which has given to their details the momentum as well as the interest of a living thing. In all the instances that may be quoted of controversial treatises lasting down to our time, it is the philosophy as applied to facts and moulding them into an intelligible system that survives. The light in them brought to a focus, the lucid condensation, and the victorious consistency, by which ten thousand scattered elements are built up into a whole, have this great advantage over special pleading, though plausible, and rhetoric however skilful, and the fencer's sword-play which dazzles rather than wounds its adversary. If Archbishop Benson has explained St. Cyprian to us, he will last. But if he did not explain him even to himself—what then? A theory was wanted to clear up the phenomena which constitute in the middle of the third century the relations of Carthage to Rome, and of the African Primate to Pope Stephen. Let us see whether in this new account of the matter we have such an explanation as can satisfy our demands.

To begin with, it is by no means easy reading. The Archbishop, long a school-master and immersed in Thucydides, had come to disdain the obvious; he would not indulge us with "the customary periphrases," and so, without necessity, his style is obscure. Sometimes it has more than a touch of George Meredith; it is abrupt and humorous, affected in its turns, not persuasive, quaint and almost Evangelical; it fails to carry us along, and when a summary of doctrine is attempted we cannot be sure that we understand what is written. There was certainly no need of an embarrassed or cryptic manner in dealing with St. Cyprian. His own natural eloquence would have set an example which the biographer might have done well to follow. In disputation the epigrams of Tertullian may sear and sting; in sketching that strange Numidian world his colors lay ready to the painter's hand, although little used by him. But what is Thucydides doing here? It would have been more to the purpose had St. Augustine, St. Leo, and the Fathers of the Church, afforded, in a volume so ecclesiastical, the standard of language and of reasoning. But now we are hinting at a grave defect which strikes one almost as soon as one has opened these pages.

The Archbishop does not write like a divine or a philosopher. His theory of Church government, if he has one, is in the clouds; and his grasp of dogmatic theology, unless the present writing does him an injustice, can never have been firm. It is an excellent thing to know the topography of Mauritania, to have seen with one's own eyes the mountain-throne of Cirta—incomparable for sublimity; to be well up in the antiquities of Carthage, and to have tasted the Tunisian air; but all this serves only as a frame to

those who ask for the picture ; and the picture must be historical, Christian, Catholic, or it will not be a true one. Was there not a Catholic Church in the third century, with its world-wide tradition, its East and West, its usages, customs, rules? And can we not learn what these came to in practice from the fourth, which appealed to them as of ancient standing? Or if it be affirmed that after Nicæa corruption came in like a flood, upon whom does the burden of proof rest? Not surely on those who maintain that there is a Divine principle of consistency in the Church, and that to innovate against the Creed is heresy, but upon every one who, declining what is manifest in the age of St. Leo and at the Council of Chalcedon, should be able to trace the line where Papal usurpation began and as such was resisted. To attempt this, however, implies a philosophical largeness of view which shall take in the whole Christian development, nor isolate any of its phenomena under pretence of explaining them by themselves. What the antiquarian would not dream of, must be forbidden to the divine. Nevertheless, Dr. Benson has isolated his Cyprian, and so has failed to account for him.

This proceeding is all the more singular that in method he believed himself to be walking in the steps of Bishop Lightfoot—a man so cautious, but with so well-trained an eye, as to have triumphed gloriously over the scepticism that would have dissolved Ignatius of Antioch and his epistles into mere forgery. Since the appearance of those admirable volumes in 1885, this long-cherished enterprise on the part of unbelievers has been made forever impossible. We can now rely upon the seven shorter Greek epistles as a luminous chapter of history, taking us back to the years of Trajan. But Bishop Lightfoot, in marshalling his proofs, ranged over the entire field of evidence ; whereas Dr. Benson, who must have known, as we all do, the arguments for Papal jurisdiction drawn from the writings or the acts of Pope Julius, Pope Damasus, Pope Innocent I., Pope Celestine, and Pope Leo the Great ; and from the contemporary witness of Saints like Augustine, Jerome, Optatus, Prosper, as well as from the behavior of Eastern Councils and Eastern Bishops, leaves all this below the horizon or behind the curtain, as though Cyprian were a law to the Church, and tradition had no purchase upon him. That is what we mean when we refuse to the Archbishop credit as a theologian. If he had explicitly assumed from Dr. Lightfoot the evidence for Episcopacy, and gone on to deal, in as candid a fashion, with the evidence for the Papacy, we should not quarrel with his method though we might demur to his conclusions. It is certainly in favor of the Catholic doctrine that we do not ground it upon a solitary text of Scripture, nor yet upon some few incidents of Church history, but

upon an induction of all the facts, corresponding like fulfilled prophecy with a system the outline of which we draw from both Testaments, the New and the Old. Against this combination of supernatural principles, promises and events, stretching over the course of ages, and resulting in a living unconquerable Christianity, the hope of mankind, what would it avail though Cyprian had misinterpreted his own axioms, or had fallen into error upon a subject not fully brought out in his time? Will those who agree with Archbishop Benson mete the same measure to the Ante-Nicene Fathers, accused of ambiguity or misunderstanding as regards the Blessed Trinity itself and our Lord's Eternal Sonship? And if they dare not, will they be still so partisan in their dealing as to divide Cyprian from the Senate of the Fathers and let him stand alone, a rebel to tradition and the first sketch of an heresiarch? Either he was at one with that tradition, or his evidence is powerless against it. We can, however, by taking the whole case into our view, so fairly interpret him that his noble argument "*De Unitate Ecclesiæ*" shall become the very cornerstone of the Roman power. Thus, at all events, it was understood half a century ago by Professor Ramsey—himself neither an Anglican nor an Ultramontane—when he wrote: "This remarkable treatise is of the utmost importance to the student of ecclesiastical history, since here we first find the doctrine of Catholicism and of the typical character of St. Peter developed in that form which was afterwards assumed by the bishops of Rome as the basis of Papal Supremacy."<sup>1</sup>

It is the undying merit of this great convert, bishop, saint, and martyr, to have left us, in a small but most eloquent volume, the Catholic view of the Episcopate. And in doing so, he has by anticipation provided against that scandal of our times, the multiplication of sects according to men's private judgment. Yet no one must imagine, though some hasty German critics like Ritschl would fain charge him with it, that Cyprian was an innovator; that he found a presbyterian constitution of the Church, and to enhance his own authority, reformed it, partly by acts of violence and still more by unwarrantable reasonings, into a despotic oligarchy. The Primate of Carthage owned a master and obeyed a tradition. That master was the brilliant, the severe, the clear-sighted Tertullian, who had broken in to the service of Christian dogma the proudest language ever heard on the lips of man. "*Da mihi Magistrum*," would his disciple exclaim, as St. Jerome tells us, when he turned, day after day, to those pamphlets studded with happy formulas which the schools have since made our common inheritance. But the wonder in this fiery genius, this Ter-

---

<sup>1</sup> Smith's *Dict. of Biogr.*, "Cyprian," vol. ii., p. 914.

tullian,—original beyond any Latin except Seneca,—was that he maintained the Catholic Tradition, as by its unity and priority of descent shutting out of court all heresies, and forbidding them an appeal whether to reason or to Scripture against that which had been delivered. Such was the rule of “prescription,” from which, by a short and clear pedigree, we come down to St. Cyprian and his standard treatise. Between these two men a “consanguinity of doctrine” is as certain as history can make it. Do we look in the first for the “typical character of St. Peter?” We shall find it in the bold and pregnant sentence, “If thou think Heaven still closed, remember that the Lord hath here [in this world] left its keys to Peter, and through him to the Church.”<sup>1</sup> But the fanatic has become a Montanist. He shall none the less be compelled to bear his witness, scornfully yet all the more significantly, to the line of evolution in Church government. “I hear,” he exclaims with a sarcastic laugh, “that an edict, yea, a peremptory one, hath been put out; the Supreme Pontiff, forsooth, that is to say, the bishop of bishops, declares”<sup>2</sup> that he will admit certain penitents to reconciliation. It is a gibe in Luther’s style; and its terms sound much too Roman to admit of their being applied, as Dr. Benson rather hesitatingly supposes, to a provincial Bishop like him of Carthage. If it was not aimed at Pope Callistus, then its object was Pope Zephyrinus. Had Cyprian read the words? It is highly probable; and he may have had them in mind at a later and less happy time, when his devotion to the Visible Unity of the Church—for on this point we are all at one—had hurried him into a grievous mistake, and put variance between him and the Holy See. “None of us,” he then said at the famous council—we borrow Jeremy Taylor’s rendering—“makes himself a bishop of bishops, or, by tyrannical power, drives his colleagues to a necessity of obedience; since every bishop, according to the licence of his own liberty and power, hath his own choice, and cannot be judged by another; nor yet himself judge another; but let us all expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who only and alone hath the power of setting us in the government of his Church, and judging of what we do.”<sup>3</sup>

These words we quote now in full because they furnish the *locus classicus* in Cyprian on which our Anglican friends, down to the late Archbishop, have constantly relied, as proving the Pope a usurper and the primitive bishops independent of Rome. We shall have no great difficulty in showing, as we go forward, that they prove nothing, for they prove too much. The utmost that can be

<sup>1</sup> Tert., *Adv. Gnost. Scorpiace*, x.

<sup>2</sup> *De Pudicitia*, c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Dissuasive from Popery*, i. Sec. x. Heber’s Ed., vol. x., 181. Migne Tert., iii., 1053.

said, if we take them at this exorbitant value, is that they would leave St. Cyprian, so far as language may do so, in the same boat with Tertullian; they are an evidence that Rome might have been resisted in the third century by men who had taken up a false doctrine, as she was resisted in the sixteenth. But for impartial students it is the claim of the Pope to issue a "peremptory decree," and to "drive his colleagues to a necessity of obedience"—we will pass over the harsh terms as exaggerated—it is the fact of the Roman authority exercised, if also resisted, that is so telling. An outburst of bitterness on the lips of opponents does but add to its force. How great must that authority have been which a writer of supreme ability like Tertullian could answer only with a sneer! How important a factor in the final judgment touching rebaptism, when it proved more than a match for one whose virtue and wisdom, whose lasting renown and acceptance in so many churches, lead us again and again to compare the Bishop of Carthage with the Eagle of Meaux! Bossuet, likewise, dreading some greater evil, called in question certain of the Papal prerogatives; yet he celebrated the Chair of Peter as the centre of unity, and he was well-read in patristic evidence that for Cyprian did not exist. Is it impossible that the African Saint should, under circumstances not wholly dissimilar, have fallen a victim to confusion as little justified by his own principles?<sup>1</sup>

At the end of a long peace, persecution had suddenly come upon the Church, and apostates went in crowds to the Pagan altars. But they were not true heathens, only cowards who drew back from stripes and torments; when the lightning ceased to flash, they recanted their recantation, sought their brethren with tears, and asked for admission once more to the Holy Eucharist. What should be done in regard to these lapsed but now repentant? The question was new and opinion divided. Cyprian, at first inclined to severity, followed the more generous and humane example set him by Rome, which was then widowed of its pastor, but had an excellent clergy, who were trained in its spirit of moderation, known throughout the Church since the days of Clement. The Puritans—so call by anticipation a party which would have broken the Lord's net and narrowed Christendom until it became a school of self-righteousness—held and acted on the contrary view. In Africa, Felicissimus; at Rome, Novatus; both men whose antecedents, perhaps, disqualified them for so ostentatious a virtue,

---

<sup>1</sup> It may be well to append the chief dates which belong to this story. A.D. 246, Conversion of Cyprian; 248, Bishop of Carthage; 250, Decian Persecution; 251, Novatian Anti-pope at Rome; Treatise "De Unitate," "De Lapsis"; 255, First Council touching Rebaptism; 257, Valerian persecutes; Trial of Cyprian; 258, Sept. 14th, his martyrdom.

would rather break the unity of the brethren and restore on a larger scale Tertullian's fanaticism than practice forbearance towards the fallen. But the Bishop of Carthage had himself, in obedience to a heavenly vision, gone aside from the headsman's cord and hatchet. Tertullian would have thought him little better than one of the lapsed. He did as Rome had done. Then his rebellious subject, Felicissimus, began the schism, that through a hundred miserable disputes and vicissitudes was by and by to grow out into the viperous brood of Donatists, Circumcellions and Phrygian-like sectaries, who should lay Africa at the feet of the Vandals. Novatian became anti-Pope in Rome (251), and Cornelius, the true Bishop, was assailed with fiercest calumnies. As Dr. Benson writes, "The position of Novatian was the problem of the hour. Heresy had hitherto been manifold and fantastic, but schism—meaning secession upon questions not originally doctrinal—had been almost unknown. Now, however, beginning from the central see, the Church reeled with the new possibility of being cleft in twain upon an inquiry as to whether she possessed disciplinary power for the reconciliation of her own penitents." We must not overlook earlier disputes on "questions not originally doctrinal"; the celebration of Easter, which led to Pope Victor's energetic threatenings, and to the interposition with him of Irenæus, did not touch dogma in the first instance; and Montanism began as a protest against the larger view of penitence. But such was the occasion—a double schism impending at Rome and Carthage—that made, some statement of the duty of submission imperative. The "sacramentum unitatis" was in danger; and with it the "testimonium veritatis," which it had always hitherto preserved, in spite of heresies "manifold and fantastic."

Again, we say, was there not a received doctrine upon which Cyprian must build a foundation, old as Christianity? Open Tertullian once more and read his positive and negative test, sufficient by itself to dispose of the rebellious. "It becometh at once manifest"—thus he rules in "*De Præscriptione*"—"that all doctrine which agreeth with these Apostolic churches, the wombs and originals of the faith, must be accounted true, as without doubt containing that which the churches have received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God. . . . We have communion with the Apostolic churches, because we have no doctrine differing from them. This is evidence of truth." But he had already told us that the truth is held in unity. "These churches, so many and so great, are but that one primitive church from the Apostles. . . . Thus all are the primitive and all Apostolical, while all are one. The communication of peace, the title of brotherhood, and the token of hospitality, prove this unity, and

these rights no other principle directeth than the unity of the tradition of the same mystery."<sup>1</sup>

And so Irenæus, the witness *omni exceptione major*, for Asia, Rome, and the churches of Gaul: "This message and this faith, which the Church has received, as I have said, though disseminated through the whole world, she diligently guards, as dwelling in one house; and believes as uniformly as though she had but one soul and one heart. . . . There is no difference of faith or tradition, whether in the churches of Germany, or in Spain, or in Gaul, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Africa, or in the more central parts of the world."<sup>2</sup> Now add the early and majestic teaching of Ignatius the Martyr: "Jesus Christ is the mind of the Father," he says, "the Bishops appointed even to the utmost bounds of the earth are after the mind of Jesus Christ, wherefore it will become you to concur in the mind of your Bishop."<sup>3</sup> When Cyprian had these and the like testimonies before him, and the troubled times brought out by contrast how good and how necessary it was for brethren to dwell together in unity, no more than a ray of genius lighting up the whole was requisite so that he should conceive and express the immortal sentence, "*Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.*"

This idea and vision of Church unity, set forth in language of supreme gracefulness, which haunted Cyprian from the moment he was made a bishop until he laid down his life for his sheep, this it is which exalts him as a Father of the Church "in cathedra seniorum." But when he spoke of the Church he meant, as Dr. Benson proves beyond a doubt, not only "the congregation of the Diocese," but "the whole body of the faithful;" moreover, he had in view doctrine no less than discipline, for he teaches us that "there is one God, and one Christ, and one His Church, and one faith, and a people joined in the solid union of one body by the glue of concord. Unity cannot be broken . . . whatsoever hath departed from the womb, apart can neither live nor hope, it hath lost the substance of salvation."<sup>4</sup> All these unities, then, are one and the same unity; the Church, the faith, the Christian people are taken up into the bosom of our Lord and the oneness of the Godhead by a union which can never be dissolved. Furthermore, it is something visible and historical, not a Platonic idea but an institution spread over the face of the world. Or, to quote the Archbishop's paraphrase, "this tangible bond of the Church's unity is her one united Episcopate," without which from the first preaching of St. Peter and the Apostles she has never subsisted.

In modern, or in Aristotelian language, all this might be taken

<sup>1</sup> Tert., *De Præscr.*, 6, xxi., Oxf. Trans.

<sup>3</sup> Ignat., *Ad Ephes.*, 3, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Iren. *Hæres.*, i., 10.

<sup>4</sup> *De Unitate*, c. 23.

as describing the Christian world to be one single polity, an organism the parts of which were bound together from within by some principle of life and government. Were the parts autonomous and independent of one another? Impossible. Again, to quote Archbishop Benson, "Agreement is the medium of that unity. Sections from the living organism must lose vitality;" or, in the stronger words which Cyprian wrote some years before this manifesto, "In the old Law, he who would not obey the priest was slain with the temporal sword. To be cast out of the Church now is to be slain with the spiritual sword. For outside the Church they cannot live, inasmuch as the House of God is one, and no one can be safe but in the Church."<sup>1</sup> Agreement had its sanction or guarantee, which was nothing less than excommunication—a weapon to be wielded only in the last extremity, but far more dreadful than any earthly sword, and one which could be lifted up not by the Bishop alone against rebellious laymen or presbyters, but by a synod of Bishops against the individual holder of a See who had broken the unity of faith or discipline. And, if Pope Victor was not going beyond his prerogative—which Irenæus never charged him with doing—the Bishop of Rome could wield that sword against a whole province, in matters "less than doctrinal," though affecting the peace of Christians and when there was question of distinguishing the New Covenant from moribund Judaism.

None who are acquainted with the incidents to which we are now alluding will, we think, deny that they bear this general appearance. At all events, it is certain that the individual Bishop was liable to be tried, judged, and sentenced at the hands of his brother Bishops, and that he, like the meanest of his flock, might be delivered up to Satan for chastisement. Was that a coercive power? Physical, it never pretended to be; but a power it was, derived not from voluntary agreement but from the nature and necessity of the Christian organism. Cyprian, by a wealth of metaphors and with reasoning abundant, has insisted on the penalty—no smaller one than spiritual death—which separation from the Catholic social union involved. And any Bishop, for reasons shown, could be separated, cut off, cast out, slain with the sword of eternal interdict. The Primate of Carthage himself would help to put the law in force against Marcian, Bishop of Arles, upon an occasion to which I shall return immediately. These things are allowed on all hands. How then, we ask at the present stage, could Cyprian, after he had established the unity of faith and order in the Episcopate as a body, maintain, as Jeremy Taylor gives the words, that "every bishop, according to the licence of his own

---

<sup>1</sup> *Cyp. Ep.*, 4, Benson, pp. 185, 189.

liberty and power, hath his own choice, and cannot be judged by another; nor yet himself judge another"? We ask the question, indeed; but Dr. Benson will not assist us to an answer. Let the reader judge.

Cyprian, as we have seen, lays down in his treatise the general principles of Church government, and must have done so, or he would have written nothing to the purpose. And that those principles were especially directed to keeping the faith pure and undefiled, in Bishops as in laymen, is clear from history and from the nature of the case. Incredible, however, as it may seem, the Archbishop by way of summing up the whole position tells us that "the college of Bishops, then, is the very form and substance of the inherited free government, advising by resolution, commanding by mutual consent, yet not even when unanimous constraining a single dissentient bishop." And again: "A bishop could not then resist their united voice without hardihood, but if he did, he was unassailable unless viciousness or false doctrine were patent in his life or teaching. In that case the allegiance of his flock was to be withdrawn." Once more, "Purity of conduct was essential to the continuance of any one of them in his authority. No minority among them could be overborne by a majority, in a matter of administration, even though it were so grave a question as that of Rebaptism. If all but one voted one way, that one could not be overruled in the direction of his diocese."<sup>1</sup>

What a confusion and entanglement are here? Could a Daniel come to judgment unwind the web of these sentences which affirm, deny, except, and lapse into moral platitudes—"without hardihood," for instance,—when we are looking for a code of laws and rules of procedure? Has any Pope condemned Cyprian for saying that "in the administration of the Church (*i.e.*, of his own diocese) every several prelate has the free discretion of his own will—having to account to the Lord for his action?" We trow not. Suppose, however, that his administration leads him into heresy or troubles the received discipline, is he still exempt from censure by his colleagues? And if not, how far may that censure proceed? "Purity of conduct was essential to [his] continuance in authority." By all means; but who was to take evidence and to judge if he fell from it? Were viciousness or false doctrine patent in the bishop, "the allegiance of his flock was to be withdrawn." And were *they* to be his judges? St. Cyprian has not told us so, nor St. Ignatius, when he bids us conform to the mind of our bishop as being the mind of Jesus Christ. Who, then, should instruct the congregation of their duty when the bishop was to be judged a heretic? Who should cast him out? These questions are not

---

<sup>1</sup> Benson, pp. 191, 195, 194.

decided *ex professo* in the treatise "De Unitate," for the saintly writer was not contemplating them; but he has laid down clear principles, and, what is more, he acted upon them, the case occurring; principles which amount to this, that the "mutual consent," which Dr. Benson reduces to a sort of Episcopal "contrat social"—a pact founded simply on "moral force," to use his own term—is a divine power, judicial and executive. That power does not, of course, wield the weapons of this world; but still it possesses a sanction which is no less independent of mere "consent" than it has proved to be effectual; the right of excommunication lodged in the Bishops, as a body governing together the whole Catholic Church. That the first of these Bishops should be the Bishop of Rome, with prerogatives inherent in him and special, makes no difference whatever to the attributes of the One Episcopate viewed in its action upon individual members. It is a true government, not a compact which anyone may set at naught when he pleases, only to incur a reputation for hardihood. "When a bishop had been appointed to a See, he was, so long as he remained in faith and charity," says Dr. Benson again, "the visible pillar, foundation, and indeed the embodiment of his Church." So it is still, but let the proviso be observed, he must "remain in faith and charity," else he is cast out as an abominable branch. And who is it that casts him out? The Church, by her judgment and authority vested in the Episcopate. So much is evident, turn which way we will during the period of a confessedly undivided Christendom.

And evident it was to the Primate of Carthage as to us. "No bishop can be judged of another, nor himself judge another." What, then, of the Bishop of Arles? Marcian did not belong to Africa; with him and his doings Cyprian, as an individual prelate, had not the slightest concern. Yet when the Arlesian took, as it appeared, Novatian into favor, and thus became an abettor of schism or heresy, do we find St. Cyprian declaring what Dr. Benson declares, viz., "That Body"—the Episcopate—"might not rule any one bishop?"<sup>1</sup> Far from it. Faustinus of Lyons "laid the facts before Cyprian, and together with his fellow-bishops represented the case to Stephen," thus our author begins. Then he continues: "Stephen was silent, . . . and Cyprian attributed this *laissez passer* policy to carelessness. Faustinus complained of Stephen in a second letter to Cyprian, and Cyprian took upon himself to address Stephen in strong terms as to his duty." Duty? What had anyone but Marcian to do with Marcian's diocese, the congregation thereof excepted? Nor could these presume to judge their bishop, according as we have heard, "let us all expect

<sup>1</sup> Benson, p. 197.

the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who only and alone hath the power of setting us in the government of His church, and judging what we do." Nevertheless, Cyprian "urges Stephen to write 'a very full letter' "—plenissimas litteras—"to the Gallic Bishops. What he recommends him to advise is 'that *they*,' the bishops, should no longer allow Marcian to trample upon our (Episcopal) College. . . . As the African bishops excommunicated Novatian, so let the Gallic bishops excommunicate Marcian. By his excommunication the See would be at once vacant. So far is clear. Cyprian proceeds, 'Let letters be despatched from you into the Province and to the laity who stand faithful at Arles, whereby, Marcian having been excommunicated, another may be appointed in his room, and the flock of Christ may be gathered together.'"<sup>1</sup>

Here is a commentary on the "De Unitate" and the duties and prerogatives of the One Episcopate, which leaves no margin of doubt as to the degree of independence possessed by a single bishop. Marcian, it is true, had already broken off communion with his brethren of Gaul; but, until they proceeded to unchurch him, he was Bishop of Arles. When they had cut him off, he was bishop no longer. The right of electing another in his stead, which some Catholic apologists would assign to Pope Stephen by a natural but not necessary interpretation of Cyprian's language, does not come into the question. It would pass to those who had it by law and precedent. The remarkable point overlooked by Dr. Benson is, that other Bishops did judge and had the duty of judging; that their judgment carried with it the force of a decree of deposition, and that Marcian was required to submit to "Our College," whose privilege it was "de majestate ac dignitate ecclesiæ judicare." That we venture to believe passes a sponge over all Dr. Benson has written about the incompetence which could not restrain a "single dissentient bishop;" about "commanding by mutual consent" and "moral force;" and about "men whose divine commission was simply to use this and express this," viz., a "moral or spiritual judgment," but "without removing any from our commission whose judgment differs from our own." The last phrase belongs to St. Cyprian, who could never have used it in a question of faith, or even where dogma was but implicitly concerned, as in Novatian, without stultifying his own principles, and pleading guilty of usurpation when he and his fellow-bishops interdicted and deposed the Bishop of Arles.

Now, at length, the way is clear to discussing that question which Dr. Benson has had in view all along, but the bearings of which in his confused and eccentric treatment of Cyprian "De

<sup>1</sup> Benson, pp. 317, 318.

Unitate" are quite drawn aside, or even turned altogether awry. Our first duty was to understand that a bishop, though exercising jurisdiction by divine right, never at any time was regarded as independent of the Church as a whole. He must find and keep his place in the Catholic polity. No other safeguard was there against heresy and unbelief. That doctrine of the "*Ecclesia una, cujus unitas scindi non potest*," received its great development in the second century, as a necessary bulwark when the serried phalanx of Gnostic theories came up to assault the Christian. But even so early it was found the shortest and simplest way to appeal to Rome—to the Church of Rome which was summed up, or embodied, in the Bishop of Rome, whose succession from St. Peter could be stated, bishop after bishop, down to the current period. Hegesippus, Irenæus, Hippolytus employ this method of refuting all heresies, and in doing so Irenæus, for one, makes use of terms which, often as they have been quoted, are still most impressive. He "speaks of Rome," says Cardinal Newman, "as 'the greatest Church, the most ancient, the most conspicuous, and founded and established by Peter and Paul,' appeals to its tradition, not in contrast indeed, but in preference to that of other churches, and declares that 'to this Church, every Church, that is, the faithful from every side must resort,' or 'agree with it, propter potiozem principatatem.'" And Tertullian says of it, "O Church, happy in its position, into which the Apostles poured out, together with their blood, their whole doctrine."<sup>1</sup> To St. Cyprian the Roman Church was "the place" and "the chair of Peter," to which Fabian or Cornelius had succeeded. "*Navigare audent*," he says of his rebellious subjects, "*ad Petri sedem et ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*." So majestic an expression of the Fathers' judgment concerning Rome have these last words appeared to be that they are inscribed, as pilgrims know, in golden arabesque beneath the dome of St. Peter's. Antiquity confesses in them that the Episcopate took its rise from the Prince of the Apostles, in whose place the Popes have succeeded. Do we need a principle and source of unity for the Bishops who are "appointed even to the utmost bounds of the earth"? It is here, "*ad limina Apostolorum*." Thus our harmony is complete; the people are one with their bishops, the bishops with St. Peter, who abides in his See, according as his namesake, St. Peter Chrysologus, wrote in the fifth century, "and provides the truth to them that ask of him." History and theory bear witness to one another. In a polity which must be ecumenical how shall the members not fall away to tribal or national divisions? how remain Catholic, that is to say, many in one and one in many? What is

<sup>1</sup> *Development*, ed. 1878, p. 157.

the safeguard of the "doctrina veritatis"? St. Augustine answers, "Posuit Dominus in Cathedra unitatis," and no one can dispute against us that the greatest of the Fathers meant any other chair than the Roman when he uttered these words.

"Ecclesia principalis." That term so staggers or perplexes Archbishop Benson that he knows not how he shall render it into English. Often he keeps the Latin; once he renders it by "the primal church," but there he is plainly inadequate. We have suggested elsewhere, as avoiding discussion, yet as a translation which implies whatever the words contain in them, "the primatial Church." We Catholics, given the Roman Primacy according to the Fathers, shall be quite content; we ask so much, and we ask no more. But it must be the Primacy which they acknowledge, taken in its full development along the path of the centuries, from Ignatius who addresses the Roman Church as "pre-eminent in position as in love,"<sup>1</sup> to Cyril of Alexandria, who styles Pope Celestine "Archbishop of the world," and to the Council of Chalcedon, which offered Pope Leo the title of "Universal Bishop," described him as "Keeper of the Lord's Vineyard," and declared that "Peter had spoken by his mouth." The whole doctrine is gathered up almost with the terseness of a creed by St. Optatus, himself an African, writing before the close of the fourth century. "You cannot deny," he says to Parmenian the Donatist, "that in the city of Rome, on Peter first hath an Episcopal See been conferred, in which Peter sat, the head of all the Apostles, . . . in which one See unity might be preserved by all, lest the other Apostles should support their respective sees; in order that he might be at once a schismatic and a sinner, who against that one see placed a second."<sup>2</sup>

What, now, does Dr. Benson say, not to these testimonies, which, by some oversight, he has not inserted in his volume, but to the bare doctrine of a Primacy, too manifest in Cyprian for anyone to overlook it? "Principalis Ecclesia it was," he tells us, for "it had a lofty, undeniable primacy among all churches which believed it to be the Foundation of St. Peter (was there a church anywhere that did not believe it?) and to have in it St. Peter's *Cathedra*, ascended by his successors. Certainly not less veneration could attach to it than to the Alexandria of St. Mark, or the Ephesus of St. John—say even more—but was it of a different kind or order?" And in an important note he adds, "The term Principalis Ecclesia, ἡ ἀρχιεπισκοπική, was the best and most exact possible to make plain to the constitutional subjects of the Roman Empire what was the position claimed by the Roman Church among Churches. First and highest in a great Republic of Churches,

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, ii. 187.

<sup>2</sup> *Opt.*, ii. 3, and vide *Development*, p. 160.

securing administrative unity and freedom, possessing a general pre-eminence as distinct from a special function, a constitutional pre-eminence as opposed to despotic rule. . . . In the case of the see its *principatus* was undoubted. The prerogatives, of which the sum was autocracy, were never conferred on it, and at first not only not claimed, but repudiated by it. The assumption of them came later, but with that assumption came wide and deep disregard for the *principatus* itself."<sup>1</sup>

Reflections crowd upon us while reading these passages, so vague in their phrasing, so defiant yet so embarrassed in their denial to the Holy See of a power which it exercised as early as an Ecumenical Church is visible, when it was not hampered or kept down by persecution from growing to its full stature, and from acting as a society, every part of which was amenable to authority at the centre. It is Pope Julius, in the age of Constantine (342), who declares, according to St. Athanasius, that the Eusebian heretics, in assembling a Council without his leave, "had acted against the Canons because they had not called him to the Council, the Ecclesiastical Canon commanding that the churches ought not to make canons beside the will of the Bishop of Rome." Could Leo XIII. say more? Was such a Papal veto nothing but "a general pre-eminence as distinct from a special function"? Yet Julius tells the Easterns, "what we have received from the Blessed Apostle Peter, that I signify to you; and I should not have written this, as deeming that these things are manifest unto all men, had not these proceedings so disturbed us." At Chalcedon—and I presume that towards the fourth Ecumenical Council no Anglican Archbishop will take up the rôle of a schismatic—at Chalcedon, therefore, Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, was deposed, on the ground of his having "presumed to hold a council without the authority of the Apostolic See, which had never been done, nor was lawful to do."<sup>2</sup> Shall we protest straightway against the excesses of "autocracy" and "despotic rule"? or must we not rather acknowledge in such repeated acts of supreme jurisdiction, extending over the fourth and fifth centuries, dealing with assemblies of Oriental bishops, and not sparing the See of Alexandria, though founded by an Evangelist who was St. Peter's disciple, and went by the name of his son—acknowledge, I say, with Pope Julius, the "traditions of the Fathers," which have so directed, and look upon any violation of them in this point as "another form of procedure" and a "novel practice?" In what single instance did the Pope refuse to intervene as being only a nominal Primate, upon whom the "place of Peter" had conferred no power of action? It is to be supposed that Dr. Benson had some particular instance before

<sup>1</sup> Benson, pp. 192, 538.

<sup>2</sup> Vide *Development*, pp. 159, 160, 308.

him when he launched out into this sweeping negative ; but I am quite unable so much as to conjecture what it was. On the other hand, St. Clement's language to the Corinthians, though probably in the lifetime of St. John, is distinguished for a grave authority—Irenæus, in the Latin, calls his Epistle "potentissimas litteras"—no less than for a sense of order and moderation, which critics as little favorable to the Papal claims as Dr. Lightfoot, affirm to be truly Roman. "Authority, indeed," says Lightfoot, "is claimed for the utterances of the letter in no faltering tone, but it is the authority of the brotherhood declaring the mind of Christ by the Spirit, not the authority of one man, whether bishop or pope. The individual is studiously suppressed. This, however, was apparently the practice of the Roman Church for some generations, the letter of bishop Soter to Corinth (c. A.D. 170) being apparently cast in the same mould. It seems to have been retained still later, when Victor wrote at the end of the century."<sup>1</sup> Calling to mind Cyprian's dictum, "the Bishop is in the Church and the Church in the Bishop," we have no difficulty in comprehending that modest yet imperial style. It was befitting "the successor of the Fisherman and disciple of the Cross," to whom long afterwards St. Jerome appealed as supreme judge of controversy. But if, at the very time when Soter was employing it, and Victor was on the point of putting down with a high hand Polycrates of Ephesus, we find Polycarp's disciple, Irenæus, asserting that the faithful on all sides must agree with the Church of Rome embodied in the line of its bishops, ought we not to conclude that "Clement the Doctor," and those who succeeded him, were in possession of a quality given to them by St. Peter, to which not Ephesus, nor Alexandria, nor yet Antioch, might lay claim ?

As for Cyprian, it never entered into his design to draw forth in particular the relations, whether of one Bishop to an Ecumenical Synod, nor of all the Bishops to the See of Rome. But as he knew that there must be a united Episcopate, division from which was spiritual death, so he had learned that its unity proceeded from St. Peter, to whom Christ had spoken as to one upon whom He would build His Church, and had bestowed on him the keys of Heaven. 'On one He builds His Church, and though to all the Apostles after His Resurrection He gives equal power and saith, 'As the Father hath sent me, so I send you,' . . . yet, that He might manifest unity, He hath disposed the origin of the same unity, beginning from one by His authority. That, certainly, the other Apostles were also which Peter was, endowed with a like share of ignity and power, but the beginning goes forth from unity that the Church of Christ may be shown as one. . . . This unity of

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, *Clement I.*, p. 352.

the Church, he that keepeth not, doth he believe himself to keep the faith? He that striveth against the Church and resisteth, doth he believe that he is in the Church?"<sup>1</sup>

Such is the memorable fourth chapter, without its interpolations, concerning which battle has been joined any time these three hundred years. Does it exclude, or does it allow of, the Roman Primacy which, as our quotations demonstrate, the Popes before and after Julius I. took to themselves? That in some deep Sacramental sense Peter was still living in his Rome, the continued references of Cyprian, as of the Fathers generally, compel us to understand. Else, why do they talk of the Chair of Peter in a way which we never find them adopting with regard to John, who had *his* chair at Ephesus, or to James, who was Bishop of Jerusalem? Thus, in his circular epistle (A.D. 250), the Carthaginian Saint teaches his flock that "There is one God, one Christ, one Church, and one Chair established upon Peter by the Lord's voice." To what purpose make mention of the "one Chair" if it was but a memory, while God and Christ and the Church are enduring realities? To Cornelius he writes, "Thy communion, that is to say, the unity as also the charity of the Catholic Church." To Antonianus he describes the See of Rome as "the place of Fabian . . . the place of Peter and the degree (or dignity) of the Sacerdotal Chair." Then it is all one whether we say Peter or Fabian, since the Chair of Episcopal unity is, in either case, the same. Again to Cornelius: "Peter, on whom the Church was built, one speaking for all and answering in the name (in voce) of the Church, saith, 'Lord, to whom do we go?'" Therefore, when the successor of the Apostle speaks, it is the Church's voice that we hear. To Florentius, again: "Peter speaks in that passage, teaching in the name of the Church." Let us not overlook the significance of the word "Cathedra," which everywhere implies dogmatic teaching, and how can we refuse to see in the succession of the Popes an authoritative power of interpreting the tradition, which, unless Irenæus was mistaken, had ever been preserved in the Roman Church? We have quoted the magisterial declaration, "Navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram et ad Ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est." Add to it Cyprian to Firmilian, "the foundation of the One Church, which once was solidly established by Christ upon the rock; hence we may understand that to Peter alone Christ saith, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind' . . . and again in the Gospel Christ breathed on the Apostles alone, saying, 'Receive the Holy Ghost.'"<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cyp., *De Unitate*, 4; Benson, p. 551, has the Latin text. See Hartel, ii., xliii., *seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Vide Benson, pp. 198, 199.

What have we now as the sum of these things? That the unity of the Catholic Church is in the Episcopate; likewise that it comes from St. Peter's Chair; from his dogmatic confession, which is the very voice of the Lord's congregation, and his power of forgiving sins, a power first bestowed upon him, and afterwards upon the Apostles; that this Chair is perpetual, inasmuch as the Bishops of Rome succeed to it and are in the Apostle's room and stead, their communion being that unity and charity which make the people of God one organism, one divine and indefectible society; and that "the remission of sins" cannot be obtained outside the foundation thus established on Peter and perpetuated in him, in the Apostles, and in "the bishops who succeed to them by vicarious order." Last of all, that "these are the Romans whose faith was praised by the Apostle preaching, to whom unfaith (perfidia) can have no access."<sup>1</sup> From the first occupant of the Chair to him who sat in it when Cyprian addressed these sayings thither, we can trace a succession which implies an identity of teaching, a jurisdiction so great as to include the forgiveness of sins made over to one before it is shared among many, and a communion of the Catholic Church, to be separated from which is, even in a bishop, spiritual death and apostasy. But Firmilian, by an argument *ex absurdo*, in his most outrageous, if genuine epistle, shows us that the "*Cathedra Petri*" was at all times essential to orthodox unity. "This plain and manifest folly of Stephen," he exclaims, "that he, boasting as he does of the place of his bishopric, and contending that he holds the succession of Peter, on whom the foundations of the Church have been laid, is bringing in many other rocks, and setting up the new buildings of many churches, while by his authority he maintains that (a true) baptism is in them."<sup>2</sup> Thus, if the Pope were to allow such heretical innovation, Firmilian argues, he would shatter his own rock and destroy the one foundation in which he, above all the bishops of Christendom, glories—and may glory, we will add, since not even this headlong zealot can deny it to be his. Stephen, as in the place of Peter, is bound "with the rest, but according to his dignity, beyond the rest," says Vincent of Lerins, to defend the faith once for all delivered to the Saints. What Vincent affirms in language of affectionate loyalty, Firmilian, by his retort discourteous, implies and makes a weapon of it to strike Stephen in the face.

But we have no call, be it remembered, to demonstrate in Cyprian a full, explicit, and reasoned-out view of the Papal Supremacy. He was not discussing it, either when he published "*De Unitate*" or when his epistles were despatched to Rome. The sentences which we quote are incidental, by the way, and must be looked

<sup>1</sup> Cyp. Ep. 59 ad Corn.

<sup>2</sup> Hartel, ii., 821.

upon as testifying to the common Catholic belief, extant long before he had come into the Church, and developing its significance according as events required, and as the ecumenical nature of Christianity was realized in assemblies of bishops or in decrees emanating from the Holy See. "Viewing the matter as one of moral evidence," we may say with Cardinal Newman, who is here laying down the philosophy of the subject at large, "we seem to see in the testimony of the fifth the very testimony which every preceding century gave, accidents excepted, such as the present loss of documents once extant, or the then existing misconceptions, which want of intercourse between the Churches occasioned. The fifth century acts as a comment on the obscure text of the centuries before it, and brings out a meaning which, with the help of that comment, any candid person sees really to belong to them."<sup>1</sup>

And thus, while from the Cyprianic exaltation of St. Peter's Chair, as that on which the Episcopate was set up in unity; and, again, from his deference to the Pope as holding it, and to the Romans as celebrated for their faith which no unfaith could sully; and yet, again, from his wrathful outburst against Stephen, saying that neither he, Cyprian, nor any other African, pretended to be "bishop of bishops"—while from these things and the like we conclude to a principle of authority in the Roman See that was making itself felt as supreme and final, we need not assert the clear consciousness of what St. Peter's abiding presence carried with it, even in so remarkable a mind as that to which we owe the treatise "*De Unitate*." There cannot fail to be in a writer at this stage one or other "obscure text," apparent difficulties due to his having a particular set of circumstances before him, or to the simple fact that he has made one statement, which is true so far as it goes, but not in express terms the second statement required to harmonize it with some other portions of the Catholic doctrine. If St. Cyprian describes all the Apostles as "*pari consortio præditi honoris et potestatis*," yet insists on it as a Scripture principle that our Lord "*solì Petro dixerit quæcunque ligaveris*," we may acknowledge, without being thereby convicted of partiality or imperfect critical powers, that these two aspects of a large system call for adjustment and explanation, though the writer has not given such. Bossuet, in a discourse on "Unity" no less eloquent than this earlier one, combines the whole into a lucid exposition: "Power bestowed on several carries restriction by being shared; whereas power given to one alone, over all persons and without exception, implies its plenitude. All receive the same power, but not to the same degree or the same extent. Jesus Christ begins

---

<sup>1</sup> *Discussions and Arguments*, p. 237.

with him who is first, and in this first He brings out the whole, that we may thence learn how the ecclesiastical authority, at first established in the person of one single man, has been spread abroad only on condition of its being ever referred to its principle of unity, and that all whosoever shall exercise it must keep inseparably united to the same chair."<sup>1</sup>

There is no difficulty in following this explanation, which has in its favor good sense, logic and history. It is a comment whereby Cyprian's text receives a plain Catholic meaning, not discordant with his various acknowledgments of the "Roman height"—to speak as St. Jerome does; and who will pretend that it robs the passage of significance? But if we reflect on the ordinary teaching of the schools, which attributes infallibility to each Apostle (though always in union with his colleagues), and which denies such to every several bishop, we shall perceive yet more clearly why Cyprian could have described them as "endowed with a like share of dignity and power." St. Peter's Chair, with its supreme and universal jurisdiction, was, however, to last until the end of time; the other Apostles left no separate chairs; their infallibility was personal to themselves; and the line of their succession merges into the one Episcopate.

When we have said this, Dr. Benson's solitary objection is answered. For what is left of his six hundred pages as an argument against Rome? The charge of interpolation, or of forgery, in regard to Cyprian's fourth chapter? We have omitted the interpolations; but St. Cyprian's idea of the "Cathedra Una" remains. To us, as theologians, it signifies not one straw that "Father Gabriel the Penitentiary" would not allow Manutius to print the text authenticated by twenty-seven MSS.; or that he insisted on another, dating indeed to the eleventh or the tenth century, and exhibiting both recensions side by side, but of little worth in itself, and now deservedly rejected by the best critics.<sup>2</sup> We are under no obligation to Father Gabriel; and just as little do we feel bound to applaud the impetuous Monseigneur Freppel, or even to follow that esteemed and amiable Father Hurter, in his retention of the more copious passage. How it came to be so interpolated is a story of marginal notes finding their way into a text, as they have done before and since. But if one of these notes, or paraphrases, did exist in a letter of Pope Pelagius II. (A.D. 583), we can well understand why a Roman Penitentiary, in the year 563, was not disposed to give up so important a witness which went back to the age of St. Gregory the Great. Even Monseigneur Freppel may be allowed his opinion without suspecting him of unfairness. A *textus receptus* dies hard. But to talk of forgery

<sup>1</sup> *Sermon Sur l'Unité*, p. 1.    <sup>2</sup> Benson, pp. 200-221, and Hartel, iii. Preface.

seems, we would say, excessive, when the Archbishop himself, who prefers that indictment, adds in the next sentence, "If any one asks, how copyists could so flagrantly go on giving a genuine and an interpolated text on the same page, we can only be thankful to the fatuous or cynical fidelity which wrote out what was before it."<sup>1</sup> Not in so simple a fashion, we think, do forgers go about their work. Let us be content to take the margin out of its usurped place, and to set down as amplification or comment those words which Pelagius II. thought to be the language of Cyprian, but which a wise apologist will lay no stress upon.

And what of the quarrel with Pope Stephen? After what we have shown, viz., that a bishop could be judged, and was judged, by his peers, the only formidable sentence in the whole dispute which seems to deny this, has lost its venom. Dr. Benson, too, means, if he has any definite meaning, that while "excommunication involving deposition" might be inflicted on a prelate who had fallen into heresy and schism, there was in the details of administration a certain freedom allowed to bishops which they guarded jealously. All the documents lead us to suppose that in maintaining the rebaptism of heretics Cyprian looked upon it as such a point of Church discipline; and the state of the tradition in Egypt and the East will support this contention. I cannot forbear remarking, indeed, how much more instructive are Dr. Pusey's eighteen pages on the subject than Archbishop Benson's great volume.<sup>2</sup> However, so it appears that there was a Roman tradition, and a less consistent Eastern usage; and that Cyprian was following the custom of Carthage, at least since Agrippinus. And, in every event, his plea for mere toleration of the custom which he upheld, and his anxiety in the cause of freedom, disposed effectively of the notion that one who had written a treatise like the "*De Unitate*" could hold rebaptism to be "*articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ*." Had it been such, how tolerate dissidents and not bring down on them the thunders of the One Episcopate? This, too, will explain why, in resisting Stephen and murmuring against his "tyrannical power," Cyprian need not have deemed himself a rebel to the "*Cathedra Una*." Many a French bishop has disliked, we suppose, the introduction into his diocese of the Roman rite, and perhaps complained of the "necessity of obedience" in these lesser things, who would not dream of disputing the Papal authority when exercised upon the greater and the greatest.

As regards the issue itself we may allow Dr. Benson to speak. After laying bare the principles to which Carthage appealed, he

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 208. Cyp. Oxf. Tr., 152, makes no "imputation of dishonesty."

<sup>2</sup> Pusey, *Tertullian*, i., pp. 280-298.

continues, "Against such a piece of Christian philosophy, held and promulgated by one of Cyprian's powers and Cyprian's character, backed by an army of prelates whom he restrained rather than stimulated, moving as one man to his direction, yet with an independence which threw each upon himself for his argument, how great was the triumph of Stephen! No Council assembled to support him. Alexandria remonstrated; Cappadocia denounced. His good cause was marred by uncharity, passion, pretentiousness. Yet he triumphed, and in him the Church of Rome triumphed as she deserved. For she was not the Church of Rome as modern Europe has known her. She was the liberal Church then; the Church whom the Truth made free; the representative of secure latitude, charitable comprehensiveness, considerate regulation."<sup>1</sup>

These are candid and generous words which, had the Archbishop been acquainted with the actual conduct of the Holy See towards bishops and people in our day, would not have required the exception he is fain to interpolate among them, marring their perfect grace. Rome is still distinguished for her large freedom and charitable consideration in dealing with questions that arise. But in whatever degree Pope Stephen failed—if he did fail, and we have not his account of these transactions—to exhibit the Roman patience, and to carry men's hearts along with him, in the same degree is that authority enhanced which he is said to have wielded so unhandsomely. It appears, then, that by his mere "edictum peremptorium," and the simple phrase, "Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est," he proved more than a match for Carthage, Cappadocia and Alexandria. It is not by a chance expression of wrath or disgust in Cyprian that this memorable act of supreme, and even haughty, jurisdiction will forfeit its significance.

Cyprian, however, died in the Communion of Rome. He never would violate the "sacramentum unitatis," and for that Augustine praised him. "Such Unity as our Lord prayed for," says the Archbishop on his concluding page, "is a mysterious thing." His hero tells us that it is embodied and visible in the Episcopate; "the Church which is Catholic, One, is not split nor divided, but is certainly knit together and compacted by a *cement* of Bishops fast cleaving each to each other," he writes to Florentius.<sup>2</sup> We ask, is that "a mysterious," and not rather a "tangible" thing, which all the world can see, if anywhere existing? "It answers in no way," continues Dr. Benson, "to the idea that 'One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism' can be condensed into one Rite, one Code, one Chair." Cyprian replies, "One Church *and* one Chair, founded upon Peter by the Lord's voice," to which Chair Fabian has succeeded. Is that "condensed" enough as an argument

<sup>1</sup> Benson, pp. 413, 414.

<sup>2</sup> Hartel, ii, 733.

against schism? And "One Code?" But say all the Fathers, "the Rule of Faith is one and unalterable;" and Vincent of Lerins gives the warning, "It is necessary, in order to avoid the labyrinth of error, to direct the lines of interpretation, both as to Prophets and Apostles, according to the sense of the Church and Catholic world;" while, as we have seen, Athanasius quotes with silent approval Pope Julius, "the Ecclesiastical Canon commanding that the churches ought not to make canons beside the will of the Bishop of Rome." Lastly, is there not "one Rite?" Then what was the meaning of Ignatius Martyr, "Be diligent to use one Eucharist, for there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the union of His Blood; one Altar, as one Bishop, together with the Presbytery and Deacons, my fellow-servants."<sup>1</sup>

But, in very truth, and here is the sum of our contention, that unity for which our Lord prayed has come to pass, and, in the words of Cyprian, "it cannot be broken," scindi non potest. They, however, who fall outside it by denying one of its elements are on the way to lose all. It is no paradox, but sober fact, when we assert with the Council, that so far from the Papal dignity lessening that of his brethren, the Bishops, it enhances and secures their position. Revolt from the Holy See led at once in many countries of Europe to the ruin of Episcopacy. In other lands it made them abject slaves and mere tools of the King, the Parliament, the Tsar, the Sultan. And which among the hierarchies of modern Europe has the greater influence, or prerogatives less undoubted? The Catholic which cleaves to its Head at Rome? or the Russian subdued by an Imperial Vicar General? or the Anglican quelled by a Royal Supremacy, which it cannot shake off, divided in doctrine, parti-colored in discipline, regarding that in Liverpool or Exeter as an idol which at Lincoln is worshipped as the sacrifice of the New Law? But even the Anglican did, by a strange Nemesis, develop in Archbishop Benson himself a quasi Papal jurisdiction, which he handselled on his brother of Lincoln. No, there is but one united Episcopate, and one only, "cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur." It is that body of which the Pope has always been recognized as chief, and which is united to the Chair, "wherein," says Augustine, "the strength of Peter's principedom has ever flourished." Cyprian declares, "the Episcopate, above all, is bound to exert itself in the maintenance of its own indivisible oneness." What words could insist on a visible, united, ecumenical polity, or show forth an organism bound together by communion in definite acts and identity of dogmatic teaching, if these do not? But the foundation, aye enduring, of the One Church is the Chair indefectible of St. Peter. Take it away, and the Bishops who no

<sup>1</sup> *Ad Phil.*, 4. See Lightfoot, ii., 258.

longer hold by it are abolished or broken into national sects; the Creed is torn to fragments by dissenters, enthusiasts, infidels; the Sacraments are denied, or their substance is emptied out of them, or their integrity endangered, or their supernatural efficacy resolved into a reminiscence of magic and a survival from barbaric times. The Chair, the Code, the Rite, which protected Christian belief in one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, having been cast forth, these sacred objects of the New Testament dispensation follow them. And by a terrible, but conclusive argument, such as Providence compels an apostate world to furnish, it is seen how truly the apologist of three hundred years ago, the venerable Bellarmine, wrote, that whosoever deals with the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff has for his theme the compendium of Christianity, "*De summa rei Christianæ agitur.*" From his day to ours, nations and churches, events and individuals—and now the movement which is setting in towards Rome on all sides—have conspired to illustrate these significant words, at once a retrospect and a prophecy.

WILLIAM BARRY.

---

## A NEW OXFORD MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND.

CATHOLICS of the Anglo-Saxon race will naturally entertain hopes very different from those of their fellows who are allied to them in blood but not in religion, as to the future of the great family to which they belong. Whether they be Englishmen or Americans, they will have little faith in the mission of their respective nations unless that mission is performed under the auspices of the Catholic Church. In fact, they will be so far pessimist in their views as to think that unless the power of the Church obtains a wider sway amongst them than it holds at present, the two sister nations will, ere long, be upon the brink of ruin. Some are more sanguine than others about the progress of Catholicity among their countrymen, but all earnest Catholics of either nation will feel an interest in any movement which tends to promote that end. Moreover, at a time when the better-minded of both nations are trying to draw closer the bonds of friendship between them, Catholics, in the spirit of union which inspires the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, will become more keenly alive to the fact of their common religion, and be led to regard any effort to advance it on either side of the water as a matter which nearly concerns themselves. Let this be my apology for offering to American readers a few thoughts connected with the recent permission granted to Catholics in England to belong to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

There can be no doubt that amongst interested English Catholics of whatever ecclesiastical or social standing, the greater number are inclined to regard these new facilities with unmixed satisfaction. There has long been a feeling amongst us that the Catholic body in England has been less of a power for good in the land than many of its special advantages would lead us to expect. It is true that we are a small fraction of the total population of Great Britain—perhaps some two millions out of thirty-six millions, or one-eighteenth of the whole—yet there are other circumstances which largely make up for our weakness in point of numbers. The Oxford Movement, the prominence of such names as those of Newman, Ward, Manning and other distinguished converts, the outcries that have been raised against us in some quarters, and the ostentatiousness with which we have been ignored in others—all these causes have tended to keep us continually before the notice of the world. Moreover, the unique position of the Catholic Church,

her absolute rejection of all compromise in doctrine, her determination to resist encroachment on the part of the state, and the singularity of her claim to being the sole depositary of Apostolic truth, are in themselves reasons enough to make the Catholics of any nation a remarkable body of men in however small a minority they may be.

Previous to the Catholic emancipation the life of the Church in England had been very nearly stamped out by some three centuries of persecution, and it is hard to say how long it would have continued to smoulder on, if it had not been reinforced by the new fire that was kindled by the Oxford Movement. A result of that movement was that Catholics were brought more into contact with the life, the thought and the culture of their fellow-countrymen. The traditions of Douay and Liège were mingled with those of Oxford and Cambridge, and the members of the older clergy, working side by side with converts full of new-born zeal, began to throw off somewhat of that air of diffidence and over-wariness which they had inherited from darker days.

Since the time of which we speak there has been a steadily-growing tendency among Catholics to take part in the political and intellectual life about them, but in so doing they have had to deal with more than one serious drawback. Perhaps the chief difficulty all along has been that of education. Catholics in England have no university. An attempt was made to establish one close upon a quarter of a century ago, but the work failed, partly from want of money and partly from the fact that our intellectual life had not yet reached the stage at which it could foster the growth of such an undertaking. Since then the demand for higher education has grown apace, but it seeks to satisfy itself in another way—a way which, from causes now no longer existing, was not open to it before. Catholics are aware that, for many reasons, the forming of a connection with Oxford and Cambridge is preferable to the foundation of a distinctly Catholic university. Such an establishment, whatever its other advantages, could never be free from the stamp of provincialism, and would be less able to produce that accepted tone and indefinable finish which we look for in a completely educated man. It is true, of course, that a large proportion of our clergy have had the advantages of a thorough special training, and, in this respect at least, they compare favorably with the pastoral clergy of the Anglican establishment; but small provision has been made for the higher education of the laity, and the want of a better general culture has long been felt by clergy and laity alike. It is some forty years since Dr. W. G. Ward made the following remark to Dr. Jowett: "English Catholics don't know what education means. Many of them can't write

English. When a Catholic meets a Protestant in controversy, it is like a barbarian meeting a civilized man." Fortunately, such a state of things now no longer exists, but we feel that much has yet to be done to waken the Catholic body as a whole into conscious and active life, and the recent movement in the direction of the universities is one more step towards securing this result.

We remarked a little while ago that Catholics are possessed of many advantages calculated to enable them, wherever they are, to stand forward, at least as a powerful minority. For the purpose of gaining and teaching the people, they have in their favor the accumulated experience of centuries of missionary work. No priest is allowed to hear confessions unless he has gone through a training in moral theology which includes the close examination of a multitude of cases of conscience, and his conduct in the guidance of others is marked out for him in an exhaustive code of principles and laws which he is bound to know and to be able to apply. Many a priest who passes for a man of inferior attainments is in reality a trained lawyer and judge. His influence and the utility of his knowledge may be unobserved; but, in reality, he is leading many a soul safely through its secret difficulties and preventing a vast amount of hidden evil. Catholics, too, form part of that vast organic system which has its centre in the Eternal City. To this system belong the whole secular clergy and the various religious orders which carry on their respective labors all over the world in strict obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff. When he has spoken *ex cathedra*, no one who wishes to remain a member of the Church dares to question his decision. His word in this case is law. The precedents by which he rules do not become confused or contradictory, and his infallible dictum is received by all the faithful as a rule of conduct to the end of time.

It is true that the energy displayed by the Church in given places and times has not always been in proportion to its latent power. The age of Alexander VI. was not like the age of Innocent III. But the inherent power of the Church can never die, and the fact of its existence is clearly seen in those wonderful revivals which, more than once—as at the close of the sixteenth century—have raised the Church from what seemed to be her death-bed to a new and vigorous life. Evidences of increasing energy are not wanting in England, and this not only in the ordinary work of the priesthood, but also in the regions of secular learning, which it has always been the policy of the Church to promote. In the department of history the work of such men as Fathers Gasquet, Stevenson, Morris, and several others of a younger generation, is well known. In social work for the amelioration of the lot of the distressed poor, Catholics have, to say the least, not

been behindhand. It is true that their undertakings have been greatly hindered by want of means, but those who have seen the work which, in spite of this drawback, is carried on by such organizations as those of the Little Sisters of the Poor, to say nothing of the various charitable associations of laymen, can scarcely accuse the Church of any lack of practical philanthropy. The success of the educational work that has now for many years been carried on by the Church in nearly every English town in which there is a large body of Catholics is another proof that she is not without considerable vitality.

But it is especially in the intellectual order that Catholics might well be supposed to have sufficient means to make themselves respected, and yet it is precisely here that many will say they are most wanting. The fact seems to be that the Catholic Church has not been granted its rightful share of the credit which belongs to the work of such thinkers as Cardinal Newman, W. G. Ward and other distinguished converts. Men fail to recognize the fact that their genius was largely inspired by the spirit of the Church even before their conversion. Yet when all allowances are made, there still remains a persuasion amongst us that, as men of letters, as men who more than all others are entrusted with a message to their times, and as representatives of a Church which is supremely conscious of the sacredness of its mission in the world, English Catholics are far from being the power that they might be. It seems a wonder that, with so many advantages in their favor, they have not done more.

We attribute much of our failure to the want of higher education and to our isolation from the world of thought, and with a view to remedying these defects we have gone to Oxford. There has, in fact, upon a very modest scale, been a sort of reactionary Oxford Movement. Half a century ago Oxford went Romewards, attracted by the spiritual treasures which lay stored up in the teaching of the Roman Church, and now Rome is moving towards Oxford—not to become less Roman, as Oxford became less Protestant, but to obtain a closer sympathy with the mind of her neighbor and to acquire some of those outward graces which may give an exterior attraction to her doctrine.

When, early in the thirteenth century, the Dominicans established themselves in Paris, they at once became a power in the university, though their entry there was made by a few youths unskilled in the learning of the day. They could appeal, however, to the common faith and the common Catholic instincts of their contemporaries, and in an incredibly short time they had gained for their order several of the leading teachers of the university, and were in possession of some of the principal chairs of theology.

Times have changed since then, and we cannot, of course, hope to take the modern university by storm. All that we desire is to fit ourselves, by entering more into the intellectual life of our country, to take a useful and effective part in the burning questions of the future. And it would seem that the time has indeed come for us to take serious thought of the duties that lie before us. The day is near at hand when we shall have to stand in the forefront of a battle in which the very name of religion will be in peril. The religious world in England is in a state of unrest analogous to that of Europe in the face of the impending break-up of the Ottoman Empire. In the present case the institution threatened with dismemberment is the English Established Church, and the question which may have to be settled in the very near future is like the one which is waiting for an answer in the case of the Sublime Porte; that is, whether its existence as an establishment is to continue any longer. In both cases there are contending parties which shrink before the delicate problem of the division of the spoil; in each case, too, there are hopeful and combative sections of the threatened institution vigorously endeavoring to kindle the fire of new life from within. But Young Turkey parties and High Church parties, though they may appear to some to be fraught with the promise of permanent revival, do in reality but represent that feverish and fitful energy which is the usual accompaniment of decline. Meanwhile, Catholics themselves are divided in opinion as to whether they ought to lend a hand in hastening on the coming dissolution. Naturally, they have no love for the Established Church, which they regard as the cause of much of that mischievous freedom of thought and intellectual anarchy which prevails in the England of to-day. Accordingly, there are not wanting those who call for the speedy downfall of the time-honored imposture which has prevented so many earnest souls from seeing the truth. But there are others who fear that the destruction of one evil may only bring about the substitution of another many times worse, and they hold that the Established Church should be allowed to stand as a sort of buffer between pure Christianity and pure Infidelity. But whatever views they may have on this question, there is a growing persuasion amongst English Catholics that, no matter what becomes of Anglicanism, they themselves will be called upon to play an important part in the religious struggles of their country, and they are preparing to meet their opponents, as far as possible, on their own ground; *i.e.*, to meet them as Englishmen of to-day, and not as the representatives of a set of ideas which are entirely strange and unattractive to the English spirit.

It would, doubtless, be a matter of no little surprise to anyone

not well acquainted with the facts of the case, to be told that not only the Catholic laity in England, but the great majority of the bishops and the Pope himself had quite made up their minds that there was good to be got from Oxford. It might well seem that Rome has every reason for avoiding fellowship with the English university. Oxford is the home of many opinions, where no doctrine can ever be wild enough to be deemed heretical, and where everyone is perfectly free to choose his own line of thought. Strictly speaking, it has no schools of thought or doctrinal traditions; for the disciple does not follow his master, and traditions shift so much with the times that after a few years they can no longer be recognized as the same. Rome, on the contrary, never changes. Though she admits many new methods of scientific inquiry and many new intellectual movements, yet she never gives up or alters—unless, indeed, in the direction of greater precision—any doctrine which she has once called her own, and no one can belong to her communion who does not accept every tittle of her dogmatic teaching. This steadfastness and absolute consistency of the Church in matters of dogma tend to communicate themselves in no small measure to lines of thought and methods of inquiry which lie farther away from the centre of infallible guidance. The vast structure of Catholic philosophy, though subject to many vicissitudes and modifications in the course of centuries, still continues to grow along the lines marked out for it by St. Thomas Aquinas. Within the pale of scholastic philosophy itself there have been many schools of thought and many phases of opinion. Such differences are encouraged as a necessary part of progressive movement in thought. But amid all discussions and innovations there has ever been unanimity among the disputants with regard to all matters of vital consequence. The result has been that Catholics are trained to know their own mind. They are backed by all the force of a long and consistent tradition, and whether they be theologians in the professor's chair, priests in the pulpit and confessional, or even laymen instructing their own children, they are never in doubt as to what set of doctrines it is best for them to conform. There is no section within their own communion from which, for doctrinal reasons, they have anything to apprehend; there are no frequenters of Exeter Hall, Church Defence Associationists, prosecuting sacristans, and other such "enfants terribles" who are forever compromising the Establishment. For all such, if they are troublesome, there is a ready remedy in the authority of the Pope, who is not in the dubious position of the Archbishop of Canterbury, a prelate who is forever afraid of putting some stumbling-block in the way of his erring children in the shape of ill-timed explicitness. Causes such as these tend to make

Catholics better fitted than most of their contemporaries for having their say on intellectual questions. They have the great advantage of thinking and believing the same thing; and if most of those around them are hopelessly divided in opinion, and are apt to change their own views from day to day, then the Catholic minority in England, in spite of its smallness, might well hope to be able to make itself respected, even for its very numbers. It is, at least, the largest entity in the world of religious thought.

The fact, however, is that, far from taking the lead in any burning controversy, we have been forced to allow the defence of religion against infidelity to be carried on in great measure by men whose religious position is most ill-defined and wavering when compared with our own, and this very largely because we have simply been unable to get into the fight. We have been without a uniform and consigned to the inglorious position of non-combatants; and it is in order to acquire this uniform by investing our higher education and our manner of thought with somewhat more of the aspects of modern intellectual life, that we made our recent modest beginnings at Oxford. We do not wish to identify ourselves with the many-sided culture of Oxford or to catch the breath of every wind of doctrine that passes through its walls. Such a course could only produce the elements of weakness. It is a saying of Goethe that "when a man has taken note of everything, he has lost himself." There are not many things to be found at Oxford of which we stand in need or of which we desire to possess ourselves. There are, however, one or two things which we cannot well do without, and it is these alone that we seek at the university.

It is hard for us to resist the influences of our times, and, whether we will it or not, we shall have to struggle for very life against the forces of intellectual anarchy about us. These forces are actively at work in both our universities, and unless Catholic students are well upon their guard and fixed in their principles, they are sure to be drawn into the vortex of doubt and promiscuous inquiry. The bloom of decay growing upon that vast assemblage of creeds and beliefs and theories, new and old, which form so much of the subject-matter of modern culture, must necessarily possess dangerous attractions for those who hitherto have been educated according to one idea. It is therefore necessary that all such as are bent upon reaping more gain than loss from their contact with the culture of the universities should be made definitely aware of what their own position as Catholics is, and how vitally the Catholic ideal differs from the half-Christian, half-pagan ideal of modern England. Nor does this necessity hold in the case only of those who frequent the universities; it applies to the whole body of

English-speaking Catholics, who have to grasp more and more clearly every day the all-important truth that, though it is needful for them to know—and in many respects to sympathize with—the spirit of their times, their real strength lies not in their assimilation to that spirit, but in their clearer and more definitive separation from it. Catholics, as such, represent the spirit of all times. They have that within them which Catholics have had since the time of our Lord, and which none but Catholics can have or ever will have, and that is the inward and essential spirit of the Christian Church. Whatever changes may come over the civilization of the world, however men may alter their views of human life and human destiny, there will always remain, in a greater or less degree, in the hearts of all true Catholics, a savor of that uncompromising spirit which refused to compound with the paganism of imperial Rome, and which must always be more or less antagonistic to the existing spirit of the times. And Catholics of our own days, whether they be English or American, if their religion is not to be a thing of mere outward form—as little a part of themselves as are their Sunday clothes—will feel the imperious need of preserving this spirit by every means in their power. A greater intensity of the Catholic spirit and a greater prominence of the Catholic idea are all the more necessary in our own days, when we are striving to create for ourselves, within due limits, a closer contact with the secular spirit and a better knowledge of the secular idea. If there is to be a greater intensity in our secular life, there is all the more reason for a corresponding growth of intensity in our inward Catholic spirit which is the essential part of our religious life.

We gather from current politics a notion of what power may be acquired by an organized minority with a definite set of opinions and a uniform plan of action.<sup>1</sup> A similar influence may be gained in the sphere of intellect by a small body of men who are all earnestly bent upon propagating the same views, provided, of course, that they have something to say which is worth listening to, and that they carry on their contest with the necessary ability. Their influence will be all the greater if the school they represent is observed to stand steadily to its principles, whilst its opponents are continually obliged to shift their ground.

Our task, then, as Catholics, is to organize ourselves as a body of men who know their own mind, and are enthusiastic in the great cause for which alone they know they ought to live. We need the requisite amount of tactful aggressiveness in pushing the Catholic idea. In our dislike of noisy propagandism we are in-

---

<sup>1</sup> We refer, of course, especially to the "Centre" party in Germany.

clined at times to leave the conversion of our countrymen to the direct influence of the Holy Ghost, without any great effort on our part at becoming the instruments of divine grace for our neighbors. It is true that the problem of approaching our fellow-countrymen is a difficult one; but before the question of ways and means there comes the need of recognizing our own position and organizing our own forces. A livelier sense of responsibility has to be awakened in Catholics of the rising generation, who are but too often kept in the darkest ignorance of the situation in which it will soon become their duty to play a part. Many of us, too, are inclined to assume an air of self-complacency in the religious advantages into which we were born, and to treat in a contemptuous or hostile spirit those who are less favored than ourselves and refuse to recognize our claims. We are sometimes tempted to use the weapons of ridicule and satire at a time when forbearance and a kindly sympathy with the difficulties of our antagonists are likely to be the most effective part of our controversy. It is in order to remedy such defects as these, and to promote a clearer general perception of the realities of our position, that some organized effort might be made to set flowing a current of Catholic ideas which shall represent old things under new aspects.

In order to achieve this result we do not need any novel kind of weapon or the growth of any new movement. Our weapons are ready to hand, but they need refurbishing, and the movement we desire is even now on foot; but it needs to be accelerated. What wonders might not be worked by the press and the platform if skilfully organized in the Catholic cause? It is true that members of the Anglo-Saxon race, especially Englishmen, are slower than certain of their neighbors to take up new ideas; yet it is none the less true that they are largely ruled by ideas, as a careful examination of the history—especially the religious history—both of England and America will show. They require, in order to overcome their initial cautiousness or indifference, that the ideas should be kept steadily and perseveringly before them, so that they may have full time to take in and assimilate them. Men are always ready to take an interest in what they hold to be burning questions, but they do not recognize them to be such unless they are discussed with great frequency and in language which they themselves can understand. Those, therefore, who are responsible for the ventilation of ideas—our lecturers, writers, journalists—must necessarily be men who are able to feel and diagnose the temper of the body which they are seeking to benefit. They must, moreover, in all their work have a distinct and uniform purpose in view, together with a united plan of action. In short, those whose work is in the dominion of literature—and it is

chiefly with these that we are dealing—should possess the quality of distinctiveness.

Distinctiveness is the result of more causes than one, and the ways, too, in which it shows itself are manifold. It may be described, however, in general, as a character of style whereby the personality of the writer is reflected in a high and commanding degree, and in which the definiteness and consistency of his opinions are fitly and gracefully portrayed. Mere good taste and literary training cannot of themselves produce the note of distinctiveness; it must spring from the deeper sources of a steady enthusiasm, earnestness in a worthy cause and the prominence of one overmastering idea. When Mr. Ruskin wrote the first volumes of "Modern Painters" he at once became a leader among artists and men of letters, because to all the arts of the word-painter he added the higher virtues of a comprehensive clearness of aim and a lofty earnestness of purpose which marked him out as almost a prophet among teachers. In other words, he had the character of distinctiveness, and it was because of this character that he was able to attract to himself so large a following and to work such a change in the ideas which his contemporaries possessed about the existence of high and immutable principles in art.

Somewhat similar to Ruskin's apostleship in art was the influence exerted by Newman upon religion in England. Newman, too, was distinctive. He, too, was able to take a comprehensive view of that part of the situation which concerned himself, viz., the state of religion in England, while his earnest and commanding character was able to take far more than a merely speculative interest in the religious events of his time. The result was that he, too, became a leader among men, and was able to impress his own higher convictions upon the minds of his countrymen.

Distinctiveness, whether in literature or the pulpit or in the intercourse of daily life, is a quality which belongs to all great and influential work. But it need not necessarily be confined to a few individuals. Over and over again in the history of the world it has been found in great bodies of men who were one and all fired by the same animating spirit. It existed in a high and commanding degree among the Apostles and early Christians, who were all possessed of "one heart and one soul." It existed, too, among the friars of the thirteenth century, whose influence was such that men began to ask whether, soon, there would be enough men and women outside the walls of the monastery to carry on the work of peopling Christendom. Lastly, it existed in another shape and form among those fathers of the Society of Jesus who were trained by Saint Ignatius in the common spirit of the *Exercises*.

All great centres of light and leading, all founders of intellectual movements, whether they have been individuals or schools of thought, have been men who, by their own earnest efforts and the blessing of Providence, have found expression for the undefined yearnings and given a direction to the unguided zeal of their contemporaries. They have impressed their spirit upon large classes of men who only needed leaders in order to rouse them into fruitful activity. There seems reason for believing that leaders of this sort in the future will stand out less and less as individuals, and that the influence of single masters of thought will give place to that of large organized schools. That this should be the case would seem to follow from the general tendencies of our democratic days, in which men act so much in combination and the influence of leadership is apt to become less manifest than of old. Moreover, in the world of letters so much work of good average merit is produced, and so hard is it for individuals to attract more than a passing notice, that if any good cause has to be promoted, it must be promoted by co-operation. The co-operators must be men of one mind, and if they are possessed of some great and worthy aim which so influences their minds as to give a certain color to their every thought, there will be a tendency towards a marked and distinctive tone in all their writings. This distinctiveness will give them power, and whether they be controversialists, social reformers or men of science, whatever they say will surely be listened to. It now remains to consider how far the note of distinctiveness can be claimed by Catholic writers, and, if wanting, how far it can be acquired by the force of a conscious effort.

But here it may be objected that the whole question we are considering is a useless one; that Catholic effort must not live in the domain of literature, but must work in the direction of social improvement. The advocates of such a policy may point out that at this very moment much lost ground is being recovered by the Church in Italy, Germany and France by the enlightened activity of the clergy in promoting such good works as co-operative societies among workingmen, associations for lending money to the poor at reasonable rates of interest, the introduction of better systems of agriculture, and numerous other schemes which show men in a practical way that the Church takes a genuine interest in their welfare. It may be urged, moreover, that the influence of books, pamphlets and magazine articles is so very slight in our days that any effort in this direction is sure to meet with poor results. To objections such as these it will be enough to say that though literature may be less fertile of results than more active forms of effort, still it would be foolish to deny that its influence is great, as may be seen in the use made of it by the enemies of

the Church. Moreover, we are concerned at present with the subject of the connection of Catholics with the universities and higher education; and, since literature stands in close relation to such a theme, we have taken occasion to say something in favor of its claims.

But to return from this digression. We set ourselves to consider how far our Catholic writers as a body can be said to have the quality of distinctiveness, and whether they show forth the possession of some common spirit in a high and commanding degree. Naturally, the spirit that we look for is the spirit of the Catholic Church embodied in accordance with the needs of our present time, and the distinctiveness of our writers must express the distinctiveness of the Church's spirit. They have to battle against the undue influence of the spirit of the times, opposed as it is, in many respects, to that of the Church, in which their own personality should be absorbed and transfigured. The very effort to preserve a common spirit is itself against the grain of modern feeling and quite contrary to the practice of most modern men of letters, who write, as a rule, under the sign-manual of their own authority. The present writer can remember showing to a priest and theological writer, not long since dead, the portraits of a number of English contemporary non-Catholic writers of average reputation in literature. The priest, who was a man of more than ordinary penetration, remarked, after looking at the pictures: "They all of them seem like men who think a good deal of themselves." And, indeed, this remark is in agreement with complaints which we sometimes hear, that no modern writer of fiction can create a hero who is not somewhat of a prig. Tennyson's "King Arthur" and George Eliot's "Romola" have been held up as examples. And some of the greatest of our latter-day prophets, whose utterances are listened to with merited respect, are not free from that peculiar form of self-consciousness which marks a man off as a "superior person." Such must necessarily be the case where individualism has free scope. If a man belongs to no disciplined school of thought, and recognizes no pontiff to whom there is ultimate appeal, his pontifical decisions must come from himself. He will not speak with diffidence and under correction when he knows of no one who has a right to correct him. We should offer no indignity to the amiable and cultured Matthew Arnold if we set him below Cardinal Newman either for depth of thought or as a master of style. Yet there is nothing privately and personally pontifical in the manner of Newman, and much that is so in that of Mr. Arnold. And so in other cases where freedom in religious thought has produced unrestrainedness in other forms of speculation.

Catholics cannot escape from the influences around them, and, whether for better or for worse, they must necessarily adopt much of the tone of their contemporaries. This is undoubtedly true in literature, especially as the accepted literary style tends more and more towards uniformity. Even the most original of men will be, to a large extent, imitators; and indeed it would be an evil thing for the world if they were not so. If the best of non-Catholic writers speak with the assurance of the self-sent prophet, and utter their benedictions or anathemas on the authority of their own deeper insight, Catholic writers will be apt to deliver their messages after the same fashion. Let us take an instance. The name of Coventry Patmore stands deservedly high in English literature, and he commonly writes as an uncompromising Catholic; but who does not see how greatly some of his prose writings suffer from a want of that moderation and self-restraint which is sure to grow upon those who have been trained from their childhood to listen with deference to dogmatic teaching in matters of religion? Docility is a faithful handmaid to genius, and it is often the only thing that can make genius of any real value.

Perhaps few recent Catholic writers have performed the office of prophet so frequently as the late Father Hecker. Yet there is a manly simplicity and vigorous faith in him which repel no one, but, on the contrary, rouse up in the reader the same high hopes and active enthusiasm with which he himself was inspired. Like Cardinal Newman in England, and his own contemporary and friend, Brownson in America, he had that largeness of the Church's spirit which, without loss of its identity, is continually adapting itself to the needs of the time.

We have seen above that the quality of distinctiveness in literature must come from high enthusiasm and sincere earnestness of purpose. Moreover, it will not exist among the Catholic writers of any nation unless the great body of Catholics of that nation are roused to an active consciousness of their position and their duties as Catholics. What we look for in the near future, when men have begun to see clearly that there is no choice left between Catholicism and infidelity, is a general rallying of all earnest Christians under the standard of Rome. When the great dividing-time arrives, the Catholics of England, America and the English Colonies throughout the world will, we may well hope, be specially aided by the Holy Ghost to see and realize to the full that the redemption of the Anglo-Saxon race from worldliness, sensuality and ruin depends, under Heaven, upon them. This great re-awakening has already begun, but so far it is only in its earliest stage. We are too few, too little organized, and not, as a body, sufficiently conscious of the trend of the times, to resist success-

fully the forces arrayed against us. When the enemies and the disabused victims of infidelity begin to join us in greater numbers, and the ground becomes gradually cleared for the great battle with unbelief, then, if Christianity is once more to assert itself, there must be a new and wide-spread intensity of the Catholic spirit. If this great revival takes place, and there seem to be many reasons for thinking that it will, there will be a corresponding revival in Catholic literature, which will then begin to be a full and adequate expression of the Catholic spirit. Moreover, the Church will exhibit new powers and manifest new forms of energy not manifested before, and the writings of her children will show forth a correspondingly harmonious combination of new things with old.

The growth of such a movement is never, of course, directly produced by conscious effort, but, if there be no conscious effort, it is likely to become abortive. Such an effort, thanks to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is now being made, both in England and America. The recent movement towards Oxford is one phase of the effort in England, where the Catholic clergy and laity have made up their minds that, if we have the best of what is old and stable, yet we are, to some extent, wanting in what is new and less permanent, though none the less necessary in order to catch the ear of our generation and lend ourselves to its life. The aim we propose to ourselves is to assimilate what is good and wholesome in the spirit of the times, whilst we develop and intensify that inner spirit which belongs to us as members of the Catholic Church.

JAMES KENDAL, S.J.

ST. BEUNO'S COLLEGE.

---

## THE TURKISH STRUGGLE WITH CATHOLIC EUROPE.

THE Turks to day, as through all their history, are a foreign and hostile race in the European world. Their ways are not the ways of Europe, their desires are not the desires of European man, their religion is not his. The band of roving shepherds which was the origin of the Ottoman empire was not a nation but a gathering of barbarian warriors for the sake of plunder, much like the crew of a pirate ship. They banded together that they might live on the labors of others by their barbarian swords; and empire, not national development, has been the principle that has since kept them together. The Tartar shepherds despise the settled lives of civilized men as slavish, the Mahometan hates and despises the Christian as one accursed by God, and the modern Turk is in all essentials still a Mahometan Tartar. The name given by diplomacy to the Turkish government from its own usage, expresses well its character. It is the Sublime Porte, the "raised gate of the Sultan's tent," where originally the Tartar chief gave law to his followers as they wandered over their native plains or ravaged the lands of their civilized fellow-men. The Sultan dwells in the palaces of Constantine and Theodosius, but the tent of the armed freebooter is to him and his people his natural and most honorable abode. The contrast between barbarian and civilized thought and desires, could hardly be more significantly expressed.

The struggle between civilized and barbarian man has been repeated again and again since the earliest times. Greek thought, Roman law and discipline and the Christian religion have established civilization supreme in Europe and America, but the history of Asia and Africa to our own time is one record of conquests of the more civilized peoples by barbarian hordes. The Turkish Empire is the one example of such a state of things in Europe to-day. It was founded and it flourished by war and conquest alone, and now that it is unequal to continue conquering it remains a mere clog on the land which still remains subject to its dominion. Its establishment in Europe was a triumph of barbarism over civilization, and its subsequent history was one long effort to make barbarism supreme throughout that continent. The struggle was doubtful for more than three centuries after the first invasion. Almost the whole body of Eastern Christians that came in the Turkish path were reduced to bondage, and it was only by the most desperate struggle and deeds of heroic self-devotion that

Rome and Vienna escaped the same fate. We shall try to sketch briefly the story of the conflict.

The conquest of Constantinople in 1453 gave the Turkish Sultans control of greater wealth and material resources than those of any western nation. The Turkish soldiers were armed and maintained by the skill and labor of their Christian *rayas*. Mahomet II. was only twenty-three when he captured the imperial city, and he was as ambitious as brutal in his character. The resources of his first conquests were utilized for others. The Eastern Christians through the Balkan peninsula had been subdued by his father, and the Turkish frontier already touched the Catholic countries in Hungary and the Venetian territories. Three years after the capture of Constantinople the Sultan moved his great army, provided with the best artillery of the time, to the invasion of Hungary. The Hungarian Government was, like most mediæval states, without either standing army or fixed revenues, and thus was at a terrible disadvantage compared with the Moslem despot, who disposed of all the wealth of his empire at will, and was served by a disciplined standing army in his Janissaries and horse-guards. The Hungarians had no force able to meet the Turks in the field, and the Sultan laid siege to Belgrade, the frontier city and military bulwark of the Christian Kingdom. As at Constantinople, his artillery, cast by Greek workmen, was superior by far to that of Belgrade, and in a few weeks the ramparts were battered down, and a general assault carried his banners into the heart of the city. The result was wholly unexpected. Hunyadi the Hungarian Regent, swept back the Janissaries, and at the same moment a body of a thousand soldiers, with the Franciscan preacher John of Capistrano, afterwards a canonized saint, issued from the town and charged the Turkish trenches. The artillery was captured, and the garrison, following up their repulsed assailants, attacked the besiegers outside. The siege became a pitched battle and a panic seized the Turks, who broke and retreated in complete rout, leaving their camp in possession of the victors. The victory thus gained saved Hungary from invasion for sixty years, though its people had no sufficient force to drive the invaders from the already conquered provinces to the south.

The remaining twenty-four years of Mahomet, the Conqueror, were engaged in conquest of the various islands and cities of the Archipelago, which remained free or in possession of the Italian republics after the fall of the Greek Empire. The barbarian nature of a Turkish warrior was amply displayed against those weaker Christian foes. Negropont, on the Greek coast, had long been in possession of the Venetians. It was attacked by the Turkish Sultan, and the capital surrendered after a brave defence

on the Sultan's solemn promise of life and liberty. The whole Italian portion of the garrison was put to death by torture, and the governor sawn slowly in two, as a sign of the working of Turkish faith to Christians. Caffa in the Crimea, was in possession of the Genoese, and in wealth and population was the greatest city on the Black Sea after Constantinople. Mahomet attacked and captured it. After a short resistance forty thousand of its population were carried off to the capital, and fifteen hundred boys of the best Christian families were enrolled in the ranks of the Janissaries and compelled to accept Mahometanism, under pain of instant death. The Crim Tartars who then occupied the south of modern Russia, nearly up to Moscow, became subjects of the Sultan, in whom they hailed a Mahometan Conqueror of their own stamp. With an empire thus strengthened, Mahomet prepared for the invasion of Italy, which offered prospect of an easier conquest than Hungary. The island of Rhodes, off the coast of Asia Minor, was also still in Christian hands. The military order of St. John of Jerusalem had established itself in Rhodes after the conquest of Palestine from the western crusaders, and their navy was a formidable foe to the Turkish corsairs which now began to swarm on the eastern seas. The capture of Rhodes and the invasion of Italy were the last objects of Mahomet's ambition. In 1480 two great armaments were sent out simultaneously for those objects. The Italian expedition captured Otranto and gave the Turks a footing beyond the Adriatic; but the bravery of the military monks under the Grand Master, D'Aubusson, baffled every assault, and after a three months' desperate struggle the Turkish commander abandoned the siege. Mahomet had gathered his forces for a new expedition the following year, 1481, but death came to close his career before even his proposed course was known. A civil war between his sons, Bajazet and Djem, occupied the Turkish empire for the next few years. Otranto was recovered by the Neapolitans, and for forty years there was a lull in the long-threatened Turkish onward march.

The sultans who succeeded Mahomet, Bajazet II. and Selim I., if they did not renew the aggressions of the conqueror, prepared long and carefully for the never-relinquished scheme of European conquest. The Turkish naval strength was quietly but steadily increased. The dock-yards of Constantinople and the skill of the Greek rayas supplied the ships; Christian slaves furnished the crews and oarsmen, and Turkish soldiers the fighting-force of the new navy, which soon equalled or surpassed in numbers that of the Christian civilized states. Neither Venice nor Genoa possessed as many war-vessels as the sultan, and Turkish corsairs swept through the Mediterranean, plundering the coasts and shipping

and carrying off thousands of Christian slaves to the Moslem slave-markets. Like the old Scandinavian pirates, the Turkish corsairs were largely recruited by renegade Christians from every land. Criminals, outlaws and desperadoes of every kind readily adopted a creed which needed no more formality than the repetition of a formula of prayer, and at the same time gave unlimited license to plunder and sensual indulgence. Most of the Turkish admirals, as well as many of the generals and viziers, were Christian renegades. The resources of civilization were thus enlisted in the cause of barbarian despotism, and the same thing may be noted even in our own day.

Selim I., who succeeded Bajazet in 1512, was as fierce a conqueror as his grandfather; but his energy was employed on conquests over Mahometan, and not Christian nations. He conquered Egypt, Syria and Arabia, as well as the Persian provinces of Kurdistan and Mesopotamia. The area of the Ottoman dominions was doubled in eight years, and the new subjects were so many fighting-men more for the Turkish projects of European invasion. The condition of Christian Europe had changed rapidly since Mahomet's repulse at Belgrade. The Moors had been driven from Spain, America discovered, and the old feudal system in France and England had been replaced by the centralized monarchical governments of Louis XI. and Henry VII. Literature, art and science had received an unparalleled development in Italy. The military and political strength of Christian Europe had more than doubled since the taking of Constantinople.

The Turks had no share in the intellectual movement of the Renaissance, and in civilization and morality they were still freebooters of the Tartar steppes. But the conquests of Selim in Asia and Africa, and the wealth which still continued to be drawn from the industry of their Christian vassals, had increased the power of the sultans even more than that of Christian Europe. Like Russia to-day, the Turkish rulers readily adopted those resources of civilization which referred to war or statecraft. The Turkish artillery and commissariat were superior to that of any western nation. The revenue of Turkey was five times that of either France or England; the standing army, including the Spahis, or feudal militia, and the terrible Janissaries, still recruited from the children of Christians, reached the number of two hundred thousand. The fleet numbered three hundred war-vessels—larger than that of any Christian nation. In military and political strength, in the early part of the sixteenth century, Turkey, among the powers, held a place equal to that now held by Russia and England combined.

Solyman, who succeeded the savage Selim, made the Turkish power still more formidable by his own character. In generalship

he was equal, or superior, to either his father, Selim, or his great-grandfather, Mahomet II., and though a true Ottoman in disregard for human life, even of his nearest relatives, wherever political interests were involved his temper was calm and his industry and forethought such as are seldom found in absolute sovereigns. His own people gave him the title of Lord of the Age, and in fact Solyman was, in material power, the greatest ruler of the sixteenth century.

Great as was the power of Turkey at that time, it was only one of several Mahometan states, each equal to any Christian power. Akbar ruled nearly all India; Persia was the rival of Turkey in military strength, and the Tartar Khans of Upper Asia still could levy armies of hundreds of thousands of warriors. The north coast of Africa was occupied by three or more Moslem states equal in strength to Venice or Genoa, and often the masters of the Mediterranean. In wealth and power for war the Mahometan world was greater than Christendom combined in the sixteenth century.

Christendom, unfortunately, was not united in itself. Francis I., of France, and Charles V., of Spain, the foremost sovereigns of Europe, were engaged in bitter warfare during nearly their whole reigns. Germany, known as the Holy Roman Empire, was not a compact state, but a confederation of independent nobles and free cities. In Italy Venice was the only strong native state, the rest of the peninsula, outside the Pope's domain, being subject to Charles V. directly or indirectly. England had no relations whatever with Eastern Europe during the reign of Solyman. Poland and Hungary, the other two Christian powers of the day, were politically in the same condition as France had been a century before. The central government had little real power or revenues; the administration was in the hands of the Palatines and magnates, who raised troops and taxes at their discretion and quarreled at every election of a king. Under rulers like Matthias Corvin or Stephen Batori Hungary or Poland would rank with the Great Powers of Christendom, but either was liable to fall to weakness in a few years by an unfortunate election or local revolts. Still, it was Hungary and Poland which had to bear the brunt of the Turkish onslaught on Christian Europe, and it was their forces which finally hurled back the invasion.

Such was the state of Europe when the greatest of the Ottoman Sultans took up again the design of the conqueror of Constantinople. Solyman began by attacking the two bulwarks which had checked the advance of Mahomet II. He attacked and captured Belgrade in person in 1521, and his navy, after a desperate struggle, obliged the Knights of Rhodes to capitulate the follow-

ing year. In 1525 the victorious Sultan led a hundred thousand soldiers into Hungary. The young King Ladislas gathered a feudal army of less than a third the numbers of Solyman's forces, and in a spirit like that of his predecessors at Varna and Nicopolis, went to battle as to a tournament. The result was what might be looked for. The Hungarian army was surrounded and destroyed at Mohacz in 1526. The King himself and most of the Hungarian leaders, including the primate and eight other bishops, who shared the campaign in the old feudal spirit, were slain, and Solyman marched in triumph to Buda Pest, which he took and plundered. His troops ravaged Hungary as the Arab slave-dealers of our own day sweep off the negroes of Central Africa. The country traversed by the Turkish troops was burned and pillaged, and a hundred thousand Christians, men, women and children, were driven off to supply the Turkish slave-markets when Solyman returned to his capital to prepare for new campaigns.

Hungary was almost crushed by the field of Mohacz, and civil war came to complete its misery. The National Diet elected as king Ferdinand of Austria, the brother of Charles V., but a part of the nobles refused to abide by the decision of the majority, and set up Zapolya, one of their own number, as monarch. Protestantism had extended to Hungary, and many of the nobles had embraced the new doctrines, Zapolya among them. The seceders were defeated by the national troops, and then in the same spirit which had made the Greek magnates prefer the Turban to the Tiara, they applied for aid to Solyman. The Protestant magnates offered to acknowledge him as suzerain of Hungary if he would secure Zapolya on its throne as a Turkish vassal. The Sultan accepted the offer, though in terms of haughty scorn. He aimed at wider conquests than Hungary, and a Christian vassal king who would serve him against Christendom might be as useful an instrument as the Servian Stephen had been to his ancestor Bajazet I. An army as large as that which Von Moltke commanded against Paris was set in motion, and with a quarter of million of men and three hundred pieces of artillery Solyman entered Hungary in 1529. He installed Zapolya as king in Buda Pest, and taking him in his train he marched into Austria and besieged Vienna, the capital of Germany.

The Christian world had no army to dispute the Turkish advance, and the only force to encounter it was the garrison of sixteen thousand men, Spaniards, Germans and Hungarians. Charles V. was engaged by the revolted Protestant princes, and could send no aid. The Turks surrounded the devoted city and battered its ramparts with their heavy artillery for some weeks, while the bashi bazooks swept in the country population for the slave marts.

The garrison, commanded by Count Salm, proved equal to the task that had fallen on it, and when, on October 14, 1529, the Janissaries attempted to storm the city, they were driven back, as Mahomet II. had been hurled from the walls of Belgrade. The Turkish officers vainly tried to drive their men on with blows of whips, and after a desperate struggle the assailants fell back from the walls. The "Lord of the Age" had met his first defeat. He butchered the unarmed crowd of Christian prisoners that had been gathered up by his bashi bazooks, and then sullenly retired. A truce was made three years later, and Hungary had a brief respite, though it was to be a hundred and fifty years before the Turkish standard was driven from Buda.

The Turks, though repulsed, did not give up their projects of conquering both Germany and Italy. Solyman set to work to increase his forces during the interval which followed the siege of Vienna. He united Algiers, Tripoli and Tunis to his empire, and the Moorish pirates of those coasts nearly doubled his naval strength. The Turkish fleets were almost supreme in the Mediterranean. Their Admirals, Barbarossa, Dragut and Piale defeated the Spanish and Italian fleets in great battles off Tunis and Prevesa, and sacked the smaller towns of Italy, Corsica and Spain, as the buccaneers of the Spanish main harried the coasts of America. The war was renewed in Hungary on the death of Zapolya. The Turks overran the whole country, and though the army of Charles V. prevented another attack on Vienna, it did no more. Transylvania, the eastern division of Hungary, became permanently a vassal state of Turkey under Protestant princes on the same footing as Moldavia and Wallachia. The capital and the lands along the Danube were made Turkish territory and ruled by Turkish pashas, while the still unconquered Magyars disputed vigorously the possession of the rest of their native land. In 1565 Solyman, though seventy-five years of age, braced himself for fresh invasions. An army of a hundred and fifty thousand men was drawn together at Constantinople to march under the Sultan's own command against Hungary and Austria, while a fleet of nearly two hundred vessels, with thirty thousand veteran soldiers on board, started to capture Malta. The Knights of St. John, after their loss of Rhodes, had fortified the little island, and continued to face the Ottoman power as defenders of Christendom. The Turks, under their great admiral, Piale Pasha, had recently destroyed the Spanish fleet off Tunis, and Piale commanded the expedition against Malta. To meet it the forces of the defenders seemed pitifully small. Seven hundred knights and eight thousand soldiers, drawn from the crews of their war vessels and the island militia had to brave the whole naval force of Turkey. The capture

of Malta was regarded in Constantinople as the first step to the conquest of Italy, and no expense was spared by Solyman to insure its success. The Turks landed on the island in May, 1565. The Grand Master, La Vallette, assembled a council and spoke briefly. He told his knights: "A formidable enemy is upon us like a thunder-storm, and if the banner of the Cross must sink before the misbelievers, let us see in this a sign that Heaven requires of us the lives we have solemnly devoted to its service." The whole body of knights renewed their vows and received the Holy Sacrament, and swore to spend the last drop of their blood in defense of the Cross, and to renounce all temporal objects and pleasures while a Turk remained in Malta.

The siege of Malta is one of the most remarkable in history. It commenced on the 20th of May with an attack on the outpost of St. Elmo, garrisoned by three hundred knights and thirteen hundred soldiers, who all kept their war vow and died to a man before the castle was carried in June. Eight thousand Turks had perished in the capture of St. Elmo, and the commander sent a summons to the city to surrender on honorable terms. La Vallette told him to take possession if he could, and the siege went on fiercely for four months. The Turks again and again assaulted the walls with courage like that of their descendants at Plevna; but though three-quarters of the Christians had perished, the survivors again and again, in ten assaults, hurled back the Janissaries. On the 11th of September, when La Vallette had only six hundred men left fit for service, the Turks lost heart, and the rumor that a Spanish fleet was coming made them hastily abandon their artillery and embark in flight. They had left twenty-five thousand of their best soldiers, including Dragut, the great corsair admiral, on the Maltese shores.

Solyman was preparing for the campaign against Vienna when his defeated navy returned from Malta, and though seventy-six years old, he started on it the next year, abandoning for a time his revenge on Malta. There was no Christian army to meet him in the field. He received the homage of young Zapolya as nominal King of Hungary, and advanced to complete the conquest of the whole land. Strangely enough, it was a mere handful of Catholic Hungarians that turned back the mighty Turkish invasion. A small town, Szigeth, lay in the line of march, and its commander, Zriny, like La Vallette, determined to die with his men rather than yield a foot of his native land to Moslem slavery. The garrison was only three thousand strong, but the citadel was well defended by a marsh, through which the Turks had to build levees before they could reach the walls. Their whole battering artillery played on the devoted fort during a full month, and three desperate as-

saults were driven back by the little Christian band. The old Sultan chafed and sickened at the delay which kept a hundred and fifty thousand soldiers back. He offered Zriny the government of Croatia as a bribe, but the Christian scorned promises as well as threats. The Sultan grew worse, and as the siege went on he wrote to his vizier asking why the "drum of victory had not yet beat." It never sounded in Solyman's ears, for the greatest of Turkish Sultans died on the 5th of September, 1566, just as his engineers fired a tremendous mine under the wall of Szigeth. The vizier concealed the death of the Sultan for seven weeks, until he had time to notify his son Selim of its occurrence, and meanwhile the siege went on. The Turkish guns poured shot on the citadel until only one tower was left, in which Zriny with six hundred men still kept his post. The last assault was made on the 8th of September, and as the Janissaries swarmed with axes in hands to the gate it was suddenly thrown open. Zriny poured a last volley of grapeshot into their ranks, and then with his six hundred charged to meet his death. Not one survived, but three thousand slain Turks were the price of their death.

Zriny's self-devotion turned back the Turkish invasion. The generals drew back to Turkey, and Christendom rested awhile. The famous modern cynical adage that "Providence is always on the side of the strongest battalions" is curiously contradicted by the history of the Turkish wars in Christian lands. In numbers and equipment the Turkish armies were almost always superior, and it was two hundred years after the capture of Constantinople that a Turkish army was defeated in the field. Belgrade and Rhodes with insignificant garrisons checked the advance of Mahomet II., and the conqueror of Mohacz was stopped by the resistance of a village, as he had before been by the unsupported city of Vienna, and as the fleet which had won control of the sea from Spain and Venice was baffled by a handful of Maltese knights.

At the death of Solyman, Turkey, with its Mahometan despotism, its warfare of savages, and its contempt of Christianity and Christian civilization, was far the strongest power in Europe. For a hundred years no Christian army had been able to stand the Turkish assault in the open field, and for thirty years its navy had been equally successful. Constantinople was the greatest city of Europe, and neither London nor Paris equalled it in wealth or population. The chief Christian nations were distracted by civil wars arising from the growth of Protestantism, and in many cases the Protestants were too ready to aid Mahometans against Catholics. Only a few years after the death of Solyman, Elizabeth of England not only sought alliance with Turkey, but endeavored to stir up the Sultan to the conquest of Italy and Spain. To the

mass of the English people the Turk was then, as now, another term for ruthless savage, yet Elizabeth had no scruple in asking the Turk to join her in a war of extermination against the Catholic world, which, with more than Mahometan virulence, she called idolators. Marlowe was depicting Turk and Tartar in their true colors on the English stage when the English sovereign was begging the blood-stained murderer of his brothers, who then occupied the Turkish throne, to send his fleet "against that idolator, the King of Spain, who, relying on the help of the Pope and all idolatrous princes, designs to crush the Queen of England, and then to turn his whole power to the destruction of the Sultan." The English Queen, like the Dutch traders who trampled on the Cross in Japan, was most anxious to show the Mahometans the difference between *her* Christianity and that of men like Zriny and the Knights of Malta. "The unconquered and most puissant Defender of the True Faith against the Idolators who falsely profess the name of Christ," she styled herself, in a style hardly different from that of the Mahometan Sultans and she assured his Majesty that if he would but join England in maritime war, "the proud Spaniard and the lying Pope and all their followers would be struck down, and God would protect His own by the arms of England and Turkey." Elizabeth pleaded in vain with the indolent Amurath for the invasion of Christendom; but from her day England has ever been in politics the supporter of Turkish dominion in Europe, and it is in a great part through English aid that the Turk now rules and butchers on European soil.

It is not strange that in the sixteenth century not only the Turks themselves, but those among Christians who judged the future by merely human considerations, looked forward to a Mahometan conquest of the Christian world. Similar prophecies are being constantly made, even to-day, by self styled thinkers, regarding the future, who disregard the lessons taught by the past. In reality, Turkish power had reached its highest growth under Solyman, and the inevitable decay began when his worthless son, Selim the Drunkard, took control of the barbarian forces. Sensual indulgence of every kind absorbed the whole time of the master of Turkey, and the warfare on Christendom was too troublesome for his indolence. One aggression, characteristic of the man, marked his reign. Cyprus was then a province of the Venetian Republic, which had a treaty of peace with Turkey; but the imperial drunkard coveted it for the sake of its heavy wines, and without warning a huge Turkish army was thrown into the island, its cities taken and sacked, and the governor, Bragadino, who had surrendered on honorable terms after a brave defence, actually flayed alive by orders of the vizier. The atrocity stirred up the Catholic

world, and the saintly Pius V. succeeded in organizing a genuine crusade, in which Spain, Venice and other Italian states mustered a powerful fleet and sailed to the Levant. At Lepanto they were met by the whole armament of the Turkish Empire—not less than three hundred vessels, mostly propelled by Christian galley-slaves as oarsmen. The battle was a tremendous one, and at its close forty galleys were all that escaped of the whole Mahometan navy.

Though a seasonable respite for Christendom, the battle of Lepanto had little practical results. The Turks held Cyprus, and a few years later they captured Tunis from Spain and regained almost their former naval strength. The vices and indolence of successive sultans and the corruption which spread through the Turkish governing class were the chief causes which saved Europe from further aggressions for nearly a century after Solymán's death. On land the Turks were still unconquered, and in 1596 a sultan in person inflicted a worse defeat than that of Mohacz on Austrians and Hungarians combined. The victorious sultan, however, unlike his ancestors, preferred the indulgence of the harem to the toils of war, and a peace was made with Austria in 1606 which for many years saved the still free districts of Hungary from further harrying. The accession of the fierce and energetic Amurath IV. in 1623 brought out a revival of the old Turkish war-spirit, which, fortunately for Christendom, was turned against Persia during his reign. Amurath's successor attacked Candia in 1644, with the same disregard of treaties as Selim had shown in attacking Cyprus; but the resistance was infinitely more vigorous on the part of the Venetians. Cyprus had been conquered in five months, though at the cost of fifty thousand Turkish lives. The capital of Candia held out against siege no less than twenty years, and it was not until 1669 that the Turk completed this, his last permanent conquest in Europe.

A succession of four able viziers of the Albanian family of Kiuprili commenced in the second half of the seventeenth century, and supplied, in a measure, the deficient energy of the effeminate sultans. The Kiuprilis were able administrators and financiers, and the revenues of Turkey rapidly increased under their despotic rule. The second Kiuprili renewed the war of conquest in Hungary and also invaded Poland. The Cossack brigands of the Ukraine, like the Transylvanian Protestants, revolted against the Polish republic and offered their allegiance to the sultan. The Turkish armies, commanded by Sultan Mahomet IV. in person, invaded Poland in 1672, captured the city of Kaminietz, in the heart of the country, and occupied all Podolia, one of the largest Polish provinces. After four years of war, in which the great victories of Khoczim and Lemberg were won by Sobieski, the

force of Turkey was such that Poland ceded Podolia and the Ukraine as the price of a necessary peace, and at the death of the second Kiuprili he could boast that he had again advanced the sway of the Crescent over conquered Christian populations. It should be said, to the credit of Achmet Kiuprili, that he abolished the system of recruiting the Janissaries by the enforced tribute of Christian boys, and that he was free from the intolerance and cruelty which so often mark the character of Turkish rulers, whether crowned or uncrowned.

The vizier who succeeded, Kara Mustafa, aspired to no less than the complete conquest of Catholic Austria and Germany, as well as Hungary. It was the crowning effort of Turkish invasion that started to the siege of Vienna in 1683, and the force set in motion was scarcely less than the grand army which Napoleon led against Russia. Two hundred and seventy-five thousand regular Turkish troops, thoroughly supplied with artillery, were on the rolls, besides the irregulars, the Tartar contingent of nearly a hundred thousand horsemen from South Russia, and forty thousand Protestant Transylvanians, who fought for the Crescent against the Cross. Leopold, the German emperor, could raise no force to face this invasion, and in July, 1683, Vienna was closely besieged. Its garrison was only eleven thousand, but for seven weeks they held off the Mahometan assaults, and in that time Sobieski, the King of Poland, with twenty-four thousand Polish troops, had collected the German forces, and came, by hurried marches, to the relief of Vienna.

The population of Vienna was in the last straits, and the fall of the city for some days had only been postponed by the policy of the Turkish commander, who preferred to take it by capitulation rather than by assault, when, on the 11th of September, the Jesuits, who were watching on the steeple of St. Stephen's Cathedral, noticed the white flags of the Polish lancers on the top of the Kalenberg, which rises a few miles northwest of Vienna. Sobieski lost not a moment, and the next morning, after hearing mass in the spirit of Zriny and La Vallette, he led his army straight against the Turkish forces, though five or six times greater than his own. Kara Mustafa at first refused to believe that an attack was possible, and he contented himself with sending his reserve to crush the assailants, without moving the besiegers from the trenches. Sobieski swept on, in a resistless charge, to the vizier's own quarters, and the whole army broke in panic. The bashi bazooks, as at the former siege, commenced a massacre of the numerous prisoners that had been gathered in from the surrounding country, but the Polish cavalry dashed through the camp and rode down or sabred the assassins until they joined in the common flight. One day

was enough to drive the whole Turkish force in utter rout from the walls of Vienna, leaving its artillery, its camp, its treasures and its plunder to the little Christian army, and the vizier never halted until he had crossed the Raab, many miles from the city he had so lately counted his own,

The battle at Vienna was the real turning-point in the Turkish invasion of Europe. The Christian armies followed up their victory vigorously this time, and after a hundred and fifty years the capital of Hungary was won back for Christendom. The Turkish vizier was executed by order of his imperial master a few weeks later, and fresh Turkish armies sent to hold the Turkish domain; but they could not turn the tide. Defeat after defeat fell on them, and in 1687 a crushing one was sustained at Mohacz, on the very place where the last Hungarian king had lost his life and army. It was fatal to Sultan Mahomet IV., who was deposed in 1687. Another Kiuprili was made vizier, and his energy for a time restored the fortunes of Turkey; but in 1691 he was defeated and slain at Salankenan in Croatia.

A new sultan, Mustafa II., took the field in person with a fresh army the following year, 1695. Since the coming of the Turks to Europe a Padschah of the Ottomans had never been defeated in the open field of battle, and the Turkish troops still held belief in the invincibility of their sovereigns. Mustafa, in fact, gained one or two victories in Hungary, but the next year he was met at Zenta by Prince Eugene, and a crushing defeat, with the loss of thirty thousand men, shattered the last hopes of further Turkish conquests. The peace of Carlowitz, made the following year, marks definitely the end of the Turkish attempts to conquer Western Christendom. Hungary and Podolia were left free from Turkish dominion, and the Morea became part of the Venetian territories. Except Crete and Cyprus, every part of Catholic Europe was free from the Turkish yoke, and the Ottoman conquests were at an end.

Since the peace of Carlowitz the Turkish power has never been a serious danger to the nations outside its own territory. Its wars, though checkered with occasional success, have steadily reduced its territories until now they are not a third of those of Solyman. The jealousies of the Western powers may prolong the existence of Turkish dominion in Europe, but its own strength cannot. That such is the case is mainly due to the Catholic nations who bore the brunt of the invasion when the Tartar bands rivalled in strength the whole force of Europe and strove for its conquest so fiercely and long.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

## JACQUES ANDRÉ EMERY.

**J**ACQUES ANDRÉ EMERY was born in the town of Gex, in Switzerland, in the year 1732, August the 26th.

For some time previous there had existed in France a society, known as the Society of St. Sulpice, founded by the celebrated and saintly Jean Jacques Olier, and devoted to the training of candidates for the priesthood. M. Emery joined this society in 1757, passed rapidly from one official position to another, and finally, in 1777, was chosen superior of the entire community, greatly to his surprise, as he was the youngest of the assistants at the council and the lowest in rank by date of election to their number.

But he had already, as head of the seminaries in Orleans, in Lyons and in Angers, given proof of his marvellous tact, prudence, power over men, and of that marked feature in his character which was to stand him in good stead through all his life—his ability to win the esteem of those whose opinions differed from his own. His vigorous temperament was joined to a great spirit of order, a wise use of every moment of his time, and a special power of speedily comprehending the business that came before him.

When he was chosen superior of the entire Sulpitian body, his great qualities were naturally called into more forcible action than ever before. His head-quarters were at the Paris seminary, but he made a general visitation of the other seminaries entrusted to the Sulpitian management, became personally acquainted with their work, and showed himself a living example of the rule of his order.

In 1789 the storm of the Revolution broke madly over France, awakening in multitudes a horribly preternatural thirst for blood, filling others with an overwhelming and only too reasonable fear, shaking the entire structure of state government to its foundation, and threatening religion with utter and violent extinction. M. Emery was singularly prepared by his character and training, as well as by the previous events of his life, to meet with steady calm whatever might occur of good or ill. Although, in the face of that awful epoch whose memory time does not efface, he looked with consternation, "like all wise men," as M. Gosselin writes, on the storm as it approached, like them he perceived that those who were not obliged to take part in public affairs must not yield to despair or inaction, but must endeavor to prevent as much evil as possible, and to take the best possible care of the interests en-

trusted to their keeping. Such was the line of conduct that he traced out for himself at the beginning of the Revolution, and from which he did not swerve in all those varying and difficult positions in which he was actually to be placed.

The seminary for a while remained unmolested; but, not deceived by the quiet in his own domain, the prudent superior kept himself carefully informed of the course of events, and had the foresight to call a general assembly of the Sulpitians during this very time of momentous excitement in the feverish world without. It was necessary to consider the new circumstances in which their society might soon be placed, on account of the political state of France, the outcome of which no man could tell; and it was then that the decision was made to found a seminary in the United States, not only as a training-school for American priests, but to provide for the Sulpitians a new home and a new field for labor, where they could carry out their vocation, undisturbed and in true liberty, in the self-denying service of souls.

But the arbitrary masters of France speedily discovered that certain rooms in the seminary would be extremely useful for the sittings of the Section of the Luxembourg, and they were not backward in making their wishes known. This arrangement, disadvantageous as it was for the seminarians, it was impossible to prevent; so their superior, with admirable tact, made a virtue of necessity, and in a most practical manner proceeded to make friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, who were to plead strongly in his favor in future desperate days. He took care to have ready for these unseasonable visitors all the writing materials they could need; he had a fire lighted in the hall of the sittings and refreshments prepared near by. Then he took advantage of the good feeling thus caused to beg his uninvited guests to be as orderly as possible, and the singular spectacle was presented of a band of ecclesiastical students and their professors quietly pursuing their religious exercises and studies in the same building where the assemblies of the Revolution in that section of Paris were held.

But the quiet could not be expected to continue. The torrent of red blood surging onward through the doomed city was soon to touch their door. On the 2d of September, 1792, came the massacre known as *des Carmes*, when one hundred and seventy ecclesiastics, eight of them Sulpitians, were brutally slain. Two carts filled with bleeding bodies awaiting burial remained for some time in the seminary court. M. Emery perceived that the moment for dispersion had arrived, and he sent away, to seek less dangerous abodes, the students, whom he called his children, and who had so long received what has been touchingly termed his

maternal tenderness. He was left with a few associates in the deserted building.

Having been appointed vicar-general by the Archbishop of Paris, who was living in exile, a part of the weight of a great diocese again rested on his shoulders, in addition to the vigilant care which he unceasingly exercised over his absent brethren and pupils. But in the midst of these multifarious duties, and the turmoil and tumult of those wild days, he continued to write, to counsel and to pray; and in his twofold character of Superior of St. Sulpice and Vicar-General of Paris his advice was constantly sought. "It was not to one special society that Mons. Emery exclusively belonged," wrote, with great truth, the illustrious Bishop of Alais. "He has been the glory and light of the Church in France during twenty years of the most violent tempests. . . . God alone knows how many misfortunes he prevented. To all who sincerely loved the peace and safety of the Church his judgment and advice brought assurance and strength. Even those who were possibly annoyed by his great influence dared not brave the authority that his very name stamped upon his opinions. He forced all parties to be just to him. His only thought was of God and of religion, and yet he did not escape that earthly fame and glory which he despised."

But it was a glory to be won through thorny ways, at the end of an arduous life of eighty years. The prison doors were to open more than once to let him in, and the knife of the guillotine was to hang over his head and barely miss its prey. On Whit-Sunday, May 19, 1793, he was arrested, being then nearly sixty-one years of age. His first imprisonment, however, lasted only six days; for he was speedily released by means of the good word of that section of the Luxembourg which he had known how to propitiate by his lavish hospitality when they held their sittings, undisturbed and kindly treated, under the same roof with his peaceful seminarians at their studies and prayers.

Their grateful forbearance was, however, of brief duration. In the middle of the next July, the 16th day, at about three in the morning, a band of three hundred fusileers made their appearance to convey M. Emery to the Prison des Carmes. Thence he was removed to the Conciergerie, and on the 14th of August brought before Fouquier-Tanville.

The outlook was terrifying, if such a term can ever be used in the case of this calm and imperturbable character. But M. Emery was one of those who know how to set the house of their soul in order, and keep it always in readiness, come what may. Before his captivity, when passing the place of execution, he had gone as near as possible to the guillotine, so as to examine it carefully in

detail, in order that he might become familiar with the sight of that terrible instrument of death, and not feel fear if his turn came to mount it. In the same spirit he had a little model of the guillotine made for him while at the Conciergerie, and kept it constantly in view, to strengthen his courage and render him proof against the weakness sometimes engendered by surprise.

Yet, moved from prison to prison, and considered an important captive, sooner or later to mount the block, his sentence was put off from day to day for fifteen months, till the Reign of Terror at last faced its own sentence and its doom, and many prisoners were thus set free. The causes, humanly speaking, of this most providential delay in M. Emery's case are singularly noteworthy. For example, there were, among the deputies themselves, men who bore towards him, in spite of the horrible excesses of those sanguinary days, a profound regard. They gained time and bought delay for him by bribery, by brilliant excuses, by feigned anger, calling him a notable criminal who should be made special example of, and who should not be slain in ordinary fashion with the ordinary crowd.

But the splendid cause of the delay, a cause attributed to Robespierre or to Fouquier-Tanville, if not to both, is one that demands reverent attention of all noble natures, and shows us in strong light what manner of man he was, concerning whom Napoleon the Great once said: "He is the only man who makes me afraid." The leaders of the Revolution let him live on, because, they said, "*Ce petit prêtre empêche les autres de crier.*" And the fact was, that, while he was a prisoner, the death-carts went to the scaffold laden with men and women who no longer complained or cried. Resignation took the place of anguish, and hope of despair.

His prison-life, crowded in among his fellow-captives, and full in their sight by night and day, was as calmly peaceful and as perfectly ordered as when he lived in his seminary under the singularly sweet and mild Sulpitian rule. Each day had its allotted time for prayer and study, and he invented a means of his own for the undisturbed performance of these exercises in the midst of the tumult and uneasiness of that constantly crowded prison. At first he stuffed his ears with cotton, but, as this did not succeed as well as he liked, he made little balls of bread, and this contrivance had better success. Friends brought him books; among them the renowned and voluminous "*Summa*" of St. Thomas Aquinas. By systematic reading, and to his great delight, he mastered it, and used afterwards to say: "Many theologians quote it in their works, but very few have read it through consecutively. I owe to my captivity the advantage of having been able to accomplish

this; otherwise, I should not have had the leisure, or perhaps the courage, to read this fundamental work." He also made from the New Testament a collection of passages relating to times of trial and tribulation.

In the intervals of prayer and study he joined in the conversation of the other prisoners, and he did so with such ease, such tact, and such amiability as to win at once their affection and esteem. It was a custom, in the prisons of the Revolution, for each *chambrée* (ordinarily a room let out in beds) to choose a president for the maintenance of good order, and wherever Mons. Emery was, the choice always fell upon him. He used to say, gayly, that he was recognized in his quality of superior even in his bonds. He responded to the choice with a solicitude even more than maternal, the solicitude of a saint.

"It would be hard to tell," writes one who owed more than life to him, "how many of the condemned went joyfully to heaven, enlightened, supported and reconciled to their Maker, by his zeal. I have seen many persons kiss the places where he had passed, in token of their grateful reverence for him." He was known as the angel of the prison. The Duchess de Noailles-Mouchey wrote to her daughters: "Fear nothing; we shall not yield to temptation; we have an angel here who is guarding us." Count Beugnot, in his memoirs, telling of a young girl expiating by deep repentance and an heroic death her evil life, speaks of "the good M. Emery, the angel of the prison," who comforted her in her only and final fear that she was not fit even then for heaven, so that she went at last to the scaffold "as light as a bird." Above his room at the Conciergerie the brave and unfortunate Queen, Mary Antoinette, was imprisoned, and it was his privilege to be able to communicate several times with her, and to give her supreme consolation in her last days of slow martyrdom. There is some reason to think that he may have ministered to Charlotte Corday. Gobel, Fauchet, Lamourette, by his means retracted their errors. These are a few among the many to whom his compassionate zeal extended.

After fifteen months of an imprisonment that may be justly termed an apostolate, he was set free, by the cessation of the Reign of Terror, in October, 1794. One year later he went to Gex, and remained there ten months, the only prolonged absence that he seems to have made from the neighborhood of Paris during the last twenty years of his life. In his old home his influence made itself felt as elsewhere. "Everybody still speaks," writes the curé of Gex, long afterwards, "of his goodness, his cheerfulness, his affability, his unselfishness. All who knew him name him with the deepest respect, and even with a tender affection. To hear them speak you would think he was a relative and friend of all

the Gessians. It must be said, too, that he loved them well, and was always ready to do them service. While in Gex, you would suppose from his air of content that he had centered all his affections in his native city. He looked at everybody and spoke to everybody so frankly and kindly that each regarded him as a friend."

His sojourn in Gex was the preparation for new labors in the great field where he had become so prominent a figure. "Restored to liberty after the Terror," writes M. Picot, "M. Emery became one of the principal administrators of the diocese of Paris. In the midst of the general desolation, when religion had only ruins to weep over, and most of the bishops were in exile, and none of them could easily maintain correspondence with their sees, a man was needed who could in some degree supply their place, or at least be their interpreter. It was necessary that this man should be learned enough to be able to direct others under the most difficult circumstances; respected enough to inspire great confidence; wise enough to consider only the interests of religion; laborious enough to be able to attend to all important affairs. This man was M. Emery. He was consulted on all sides; clergy and laity alike took counsel of him. Thence arose a most extended correspondence, to which no one else would have been equal; but he possessed the soundest judgment and the surest tact, and had no need to think long upon the reply he had to make; he readily comprehended the question put to him and the manner of solving it. He suspected exaggeration in everything, and he maintained that prejudice which blinds is often put in the place of examination which gives light. As for him, he was always calm and self-possessed; he never rejected anything simply because it came from men whose opinions differed from his own, and whose conduct he did not approve. In the whole course of the Revolution he moved always in the one even way. . . . So all wise men rallied round him in those stormy days. But how had he acquired this ascendancy? It was neither by his rank nor his dignities. A simple priest, modest and retiring, he was a stranger to all faction. That which won for him such universal trust and veneration was his own personal merit, the extent of his lights, the wisdom of his counsels, his equability, his holy example, the strength of his character."

And so it came to pass that when a new era and a new century dawned upon France, while it found at the head of state affairs a small, smooth-faced, keen-eyed soldier, the idol of his army, soon to be the conqueror of Europe and then her captive—it found also ready to meet him a little old priest of twice his age, watching with as tireless vigilance the course of events under the new *régime* as

he had done in the awful days when Robespierre held sway. Bonaparte once said, concerning himself: "Nature seems to have calculated that I should endure great reverses. She has given me a mind of marble. Thunder cannot ruffle it." M. Emery had made no such pretensions, but he really shared with the Emperor that power of thinking quickly and thinking right which has been said to be one of the rarest yet most important qualities to insure success; and he was to prove to Napoleon, whose mind "moved with the rapidity of lightning, and yet with the steadiness and precision of naked reason," that there was a realm of thought and a kingdom of the spirit where he was to meet one who was more than his equal—a man whom he could neither bend nor break beneath his imperial and autocratic will.

The first interview between these truly remarkable men occurred on the 15th of January, 1801, when the vicars-general of Paris called upon the First Consul, who, by a recent speech in Milan, had given reasonable ground for the hope that he meant to procure, or to try to procure, the peace of the Church. M. Emery thought it might do good if this speech were printed and spread abroad in France and Italy, and he carried a copy with him on this memorable occasion. During the interview Napoleon brought ecclesiastical affairs prominently forward, and manifested a desire to come to terms with the Sovereign Pontiff. This gave M. Emery one of those opportunities for which he always stood prepared.

These declarations on the part of the First Consul, he said, caused him no surprise after the hopes his speech in Milan had awakened in men's minds. Then, drawing a copy from his pocket, he presented it to Napoleon, and asked whether he would be displeased if greater publicity were given to his words. Napoleon made no direct reply to the question itself. Without authorizing or forbidding the publication, he simply said: "Beware of the Minister of Police!" To this remark M. Emery answered, with ready wit, that he had no fear that the Minister would allow himself to blame the publication of sentiments that the First Consul had openly professed. He departed from the interview with renewed confidence in Napoleon's good dispositions, while he, on his part, conceived for M. Emery an esteem which nothing could afterwards dispel, and which he sometimes very strikingly manifested.

Nevertheless, although he seemed to recognize at once this mind so congenial to his own, and that was to exert so singular an influence over him, and although he could not fail to admire the rare combination of great natural gifts and supernatural graces that made the old priest noticeable on all occasions, there was a strong political party ever on the alert to insinuate reasons for dis-

trust and suspicion, and to endeavor to thwart the Sulpitian's tireless efforts for the true welfare of Church and State. As early as July, 1801, M. Emery was again arrested, the alleged cause being that he fanned the flames of fanaticism, and was the agent of foreign ecclesiastics. The accusation ran thus :

"The papers of the priest Emery are very many. They are partly composed of a very extensive correspondence, not only with the priests in every corner of France, but with all those who are exiled or transported.

"It appears that Emery is the Oracle of the clergy, and the man in whom the emigrated or unsubmitive bishops have placed their entire confidence.

"He is subject to transportation under the terms of our former laws, and his actions ought to draw upon him all the severity of the Government. To send him from France would only increase the evil ; only remove for a while the seat of his correspondence. He ought to be confined, secretly and carefully, in some house indicated by the minister."

While the proceedings lasted, and before sentence was finally pronounced, M. Emery was kept for three weeks in a little police station in the same room with criminals of all kinds, even courtesans and thieves. And now appears in his behalf one whom he had saved from error and self-destruction, and who, in her deep gratitude, was prepared to use every exertion to set her benefactor free. This was a Mlle. Jouen, who had become infected with the philosophical vagaries and deadly unbelief of the times, and, wearied at last of life, had determined to drown herself. She avowed this determination to M. Emery, to whose kindness she had been entrusted by a dying friend of both. It was the month of March. With admirable self-possession the old man laconically said: "The weather is too cold. If I were you I would wait till June." The grim, matter-of-fact, prosaic rejoinder did its work well; the temptation was routed ; and with holy patience M. Emery watched over the half-frantic soul committed to his care till Mlle. Jouen became at length a thoroughly Christian woman. While his imprisonment of 1801 lasted, she visited him almost daily, and to her we owe the following very beautiful and touching account of his life under conditions most repugnant to his ordinary surroundings. He was then almost seventy years of age.

"Never," she declares, "would he accept anything for his own comfort. He always refused for himself the food I brought him, and he gave it to the poor. I sent a mattress to him, but he never lay down on it ; he gave it to the women who were imprisoned in the same room. Into this prison, which at the most was fit for only a dozen people, were crowded almost sixty ; the heat was excessive, and everything was to be feared for the health of the prisoners. All were crowded together—street-girls, honest women, men of all kinds. M. Emery was respected by all, and made himself useful to all. One of his first acts was to send for an inn-keeper, in order to provide suitable food for those who could not get it for themselves, and who were reduced to prison fare—a jug of water and a pound and a half of bread. He never lived any

differently from the poor whom he was feeding; never any bread but the prison bread, and no other drink than water. Never could I make him accept a cup of chocolate, do what I would. He asked me to bring him a Paris catechism, which he used to teach a poor child in the prison. Many of the prisoners listened to these lessons, and gained profit from them, too; and he did much good to these poor people. Among the prisoners were some rich persons, who were never able to induce him to accept anything from them. Several told me, with tears in their eyes, that he was a saint, and that he taught them to suffer with patience and even with joy while seeing his charity and his sweetness.

"About the middle of the month the prison was so crowded that it became impossible to live there any longer. I succeeded at last, after many urgent petitions, in getting a certain number transferred elsewhere; without removing him, however, as I feared that this might only prolong his captivity. At nine o'clock at night they took away most of the number, so that only seven remained, M. Emery included. He knew that this was done at my instigation, to the great grief of the unfortunate prisoners, whose fate was so much alleviated by the care he took of them. When I came as usual in the morning he was very much displeased. It was the only time he spoke to me so severely. He tried to prove that my devotion to him was ill-regulated, since it took from me the charity I ought to feel for so many unfortunate beings. He added that, even if he had fallen ill, it would have been a slight evil compared with the sufferings of the sixty or more prisoners who were in despair at being obliged to go elsewhere. He could not be consoled for the departure of these poor people."

On the 25th of July he was finally set free through the tireless exertions of Mlle. Jouen, seconded by General de Prez-Cressier and by the old constitutional Bishop of Nancy, Lalande, who had publicly abjured even his character of Christian and was engaged in some civil employ, but who had known and highly esteemed M. Emery in better days at Lyons. M. Emery was to return him the favor now rendered, a few years later, when the poor renegade, humble and repentant, died in his arms, brought back to God by him.

We now approach that strange period in French ecclesiastical history when, by one act of his supreme power, Pope Pius VII. obliterated the limits of the old diocesan sees, dismissed their bishops, and divided the realm into new dioceses, with new boundary lines. This unprecedented decree was issued to satisfy in some degree the Emperor's exorbitant demands, and to win thereby some measure of peace for the afflicted Church in France. It has been called one of the strongest instances in history of the power of the papal supremacy, and this statement is probably true; but it is perhaps quite as true that Napoleon, blinded by his ambition, did not perceive this, but supposed, instead, that he was making the Pope, like other rulers, subservient to his deeply laid plans and his imperial rule.

M. Emery's voice was now heard again with unmistakable force, and he was brought, despite himself, into even greater prominence. He did not hesitate in recognizing the lawfulness of this singular act, which at first struck consternation into many minds. He

worked with all his might to induce the former bishops to accept the new condition of affairs and to take any see that might be offered to them; while, in the case of the new bishops, nominated by government, he used his great influence to gain the consent of those whom he thought capable of doing true service. In this way he became more closely connected than ever with the French Episcopate. Yet, while actively engaged in promoting the welfare of so many bishoprics, he himself refused three, remaining steadily as ever at his Parisian post. His enemies were fain to see him a bishop, in order to get him away from Paris; his friends desired to see him elevated to a rank in the hierarchy, which, they felt, belonged eminently to him. Napoleon was at first quite displeased with his persistent refusals, but finally said that, although he had indeed been angered, he would become reconciled to the situation if M. Emery would consent to aid the new Archbishop of Paris in the government of his diocese. To this he consented—it being, in fact, no new work for him.

The seminary in Baltimore had not yet met with the success anticipated, and the Superior of St. Sulpice seriously thought that, in the face of the great need of workers in France, it might be advisable to recall all his sons to his side; but on laying the matter before Pope Pius VII., during his enforced stay in Paris in 1804, M. Emery found that this idea did not meet with his approval. “My son,” said the venerable pontiff, “let it stand—yes, let that seminary stand; for it will bring forth due fruit in its own time. If you recall its directors in order to employ them in France, you will rob Peter to pay Paul.”

M. Emery received this decision as the will of God; he never again thought of abandoning the work in America. The interview with the Pope gave him much consolation, and his faith and obedience have been singularly rewarded. Over a thousand priests have gone forth from the institution planted by him on American soil. And of his noble co-laborers who filled the Sulpitian ranks at the time of the French Revolution it may be stated here that not one, in those awful days of peril and temptation, proved recreant to his trust.

Before proceeding further, attention should be called again to M. Emery’s keen and practical interest in intellectual pursuits. “Not a day of my life passes,” writes, after M. Emery’s death, the Bishop of Alais, author of the lives of Bossuet and Fénelon, “that I do not bless the memory of that excellent man who gave me such wise advice as to my studies and writing. When one thinks of the immense services rendered by M. Emery to religion and the Church, one can but regret that such men could not be immortal; for there is no critical time, no important affair, when we do

not feel the void that men like him leave after them." The list of M. Emery's own works includes the "Esprit de Leibnitz," "Christianisme de Bacon," "Pensées de Descartes," "Nouveaux opuscules de Fleury," "Principes de Bossuet et de Fénelon sur la Souveraineté," "Esprit de Ste. Thérèse," and many others of more or less length. M. Méric says of them that his writings, like his spoken word, compelled the esteem of his very adversaries, who could not prevent themselves from recognizing in him a grand character and a priest according to the heart of God. It is interesting to notice the dates appended to some of these works, witnessing, as they do, to his life-long habit of mental self-control and intense concentration of thought: 1772, '79, '91, '96, '99, 1801, '05, '07, '08, and finally 1811, the closing year of his life.

Yet the older he grew, the more did distracting cares and occupations press upon him, and it is now that we enter minutely upon his relations with the Emperor, concerning which we translate—frequently word for word—from the biographies of this one man whom Napoleon feared. The information given by them is of great importance to the really impartial historian who desires to represent facts and characters faithfully, and not to twist them to suit his own special bias or private opinion.

The marked esteem felt for M. Emery by the great French ruler rose and fell like the tide; but each time that it rose it seemed to mount higher into stronger light. He was not ignorant of the deep respect entertained by the bishops in general for the venerable Sulpitian, nor of the influence which he exerted upon them; in fact, he once took occasion to express his amazement that a priest should thus permit himself to rule over the bishops (*regenter les évêques*). M. Emery's answer, full of modesty and frankness, seemed to give instant satisfaction. "Sire," he replied, "bishops have grace to guide themselves; but if some of them think it well to ask my advice, it seems to me that my age and my experience place me in a position to give it."

The new Archbishop of Lyons, Cardinal Fesch, the Emperor's uncle, was deeply attached to M. Emery, made more than one spiritual retreat under his guidance, and had chosen him for his director. Through him Napoleon heard often and favorably of the great Sulpitian, and his own personal esteem began to be openly expressed. Soon after the Concordat he said to the Abbé de Molaret: "Is there, among all the clergy of Paris, another man like M. Emery?" About the same time, having nominated as bishop, at the recommendation of one of his generals, an ecclesiastic who needed to be renewed in the spirit of his holy calling, "We must send him," he said, "to the Abbé Emery." During the difficulties with the Pope, Napoleon only too often raised ques-

tions that were very embarrassing to the bishops, and which they found difficult to answer without displeasing him. On one such occasion he said sharply: "The Abbé Emery would know what to tell me about that;" and again: "When the Abbé Emery maintains an opinion, at least he gives me reasons, and good reasons, too."

It was this sound judgment, accompanied by straightforwardness and steadfast decision, that Napoleon appreciated most in the Sulpitian priest. Having made an incorrect statement one day, he was met at once by the fearless reply, in words to which the imperial ears were decidedly unaccustomed: "Sire, you are mistaken." "What!" exclaimed Napoleon. "I mistaken?" "Sire," persisted M. Emery, "you ask me to tell you the truth. It would become neither my age nor my character to play the courtier here. Therefore it is my duty to tell your majesty that you are mistaken on this point; and I do not think I fail in any respect that I owe to you. In former times, at the Sorbonne, they used the same language; they even said, *it is absurd*, and no one took offence—not even the son of a prince, if he were sustaining some proposition which gave rise to it."

The frank reply did not displease Napoleon, who, on the contrary, took occasion from it to call M. Emery his theologian. The impression that he made on him was such that he could not help respecting his advice, even when he did not follow it. "You have in M. Emery," he said to Mme. Villette, "a very austere relative, yet one cannot but admire him." At another time: "M. Emery," he said, "is the only man who can make me afraid." And again: "There is a man who could make me do anything he wished, and perhaps more than I ought."

These last words give a hint of what was really the fact, that this marked esteem displayed by the Emperor was not incompatible with a certain distrust. It was once said that he always either hated or caressed M. Emery. M. Gosselin, on the contrary, declares that Napoleon never, to speak correctly, *caressed* him; and even when he acted towards him with the greatest severity, he never went so far as to *hate* him, the precise truth being that while he sincerely esteemed him, he mistrusted his influence. Thence arose the unremitted alternations of trials and honors that filled the last years of the venerable priest, and gave abundant opportunity for the display of the treasures of his gifted mind and the virile energy of his soul. At one time, as we have seen, the Emperor wished to force him into the episcopate; a few months later he warned Cardinal Fesch against the Sulpitians and their superior. But M. Emery went on his way unmoved, in sunshine and storm alike, ready for anything that might befall him, unastonished and unafraid.

Count Molé, whose relations to the imperial government, and the favor which he enjoyed, had placed him in a position to be well acquainted with the Emperor's sentiments, gives us this testimony :

"Napoleon could not tire of admiring in this venerable priest that inexpressible mingling of almost primitive simplicity and penetrating sagacity, of serenity and of strength—I had almost said of grace and of an austere power. . . . 'It is the first time,' he once said to me, 'that I have met a man endowed with a real power over men, and from whom I ask no account of the use he will make of it. So far am I from doing so, that I would be glad if it were possible to entrust to him all our young men ; I should die then more sure of the future.'"

To the sincerity of these words he gave practical proof. In 1806 a law was passed decreeing the establishment of the Imperial University, the faculty of which were to have exclusive charge of public education throughout the empire ; and the Emperor ordered the grand master of the university, M. de Fontanes, to show him a list of those who had been proposed as councillors for life. Glancing through it, he immediately said : "There are two names missing upon the list," and at the same time he wrote with his own hand, at the head of the list, the names of M. de Bausset and M. Emery, as may be seen in the decree of Sept. 16, 1808. The grand master was sincerely pleased, and the more he knew M. Emery, the more he rejoiced at the choice. "I had always considered him," he said, one day, "to be an ecclesiastic distinguished for his virtues and the knowledge peculiar to his calling ; but the longer I know him, the more I admire the breadth of his mind and the variety of his learning." M. Emery was loath to accept this new position, but his friends finally prevailed with him, on account of the great services he would be able to render to the cause of religion and of education, and also lest he should really give offence to the Emperor by his persistent refusal of honors and dignities.

In the year 1807 a protracted interview occurred between the Emperor and the Sulpitian. M. Emery had published a book, under the title of "*Les Opuscules de Fleury*," which had brought him under the ban of that minister of police of whom Napoleon, at their first interview, had bidden him to beware. In 1809 a supplement to this work caused him to be denounced to the Emperor, who, at the friendly solicitation of Cardinal Fesch, sent for him to come to Fontainebleau and plead his own cause.

He remained at the palace for a week, and when the audience took place it lasted nearly an hour, Cardinal Fesch being the only other person present. "I have read your book," said the Emperor, "and though it is true that the preface contains one point that is not quite to my liking, there is not enough in that book to whip a cat for !"

Thereupon he took M. Emery by the ear and gave it a slight pull. This was a way he had, now and then, with those who happened to please him, even with persons greatly to be respected on account of their age and character. He had done the same thing only a short time before to the prince-primate, Archbishop of Ratisbon, who had been much surprised, and even shocked, by this familiarity. This prelate complained of it afterwards to M. Emery, who took the matter very lightly, and answered him, laughing: "Monseigneur, I received the same compliment as your highness, but I had not dared to boast of it till now. Since I find that I share it with so distinguished an individual as yourself, I am going to tell everybody!" This was but one instance of the habitual and ready tact which this truly wise man displayed.

In the interview at Fontainebleau of which we are treating, the Emperor began speaking of his difficulties with the Pope, but with such animation, and so quickly and loudly, that M. Emery could not get in a single word for a long while. "I do not know," he exclaimed, "what the Pope finds to reproach me with! Have I not nominated good bishops? It is true that several have refused, as you did yourself; but I am not the cause of the refusal. Besides," he added, "I respect the spiritual power of the Pope, but his temporal power does not come from Jesus Christ; it comes from Charlemagne. I can and I will take it from him, because he does not know how to make use of it; and when he is released from temporal affairs, he will be able to attend more freely to his spiritual duties."

"Sire," replied M. Emery, "long before Charlemagne, whose gift dates only from the eighth century, the loyalty and love of the people had secured temporal possessions to the Pope, and if your majesty thinks that you have the right to take away what Charlemagne gave, you ought to respect the anterior donations made by the faithful previously."

Napoleon, who had but slight knowledge of ecclesiastical history, and notably of the fact brought forward by the learned Sulpitian, did not reply to this, but passing abruptly to another point, he said: "The Pope is a worthy man; if I were to see him for one-quarter of an hour, it would be easy for me to come to an understanding with him; but he is surrounded by cardinals who are *encrusted with ultramontanism*, and who rule him and make him act as they please."

To this M. Emery laconically replied: "If your majesty thinks you could so easily set matters right with the Pope, you might have him come to Fontainebleau."

"The very thing I mean to do," returned the Emperor.

"But," continued M. Emery, "in what style do you intend to

have him come? If he travels through France as your prisoner, such a journey will do much harm to your majesty; for you may be sure that the Pope will be surrounded everywhere by the veneration of the faithful."

"I do not intend any such thing," said the Emperor, quickly. "If the Pope comes here, I wish him to receive the same honors as when he came to crown me." Then, changing the subject again, he said: "It is very surprising that you, who have studied theology all your life, cannot—no, nor the bishops of France, either—discover some canonical means of settling my affairs with the Pope. As for me, if I had only studied theology six months, I should soon have disentangled everything, because," and he touched his forehead with his finger, "God has endowed me with intelligence. I would not speak Latin as well as you do; mine would be *kitchen-Latin* (*un Latin de cuisine*), but I should soon have thrown light upon all difficulties."

M. Emery's bold reply seems not to have given the slightest offence. "Sire," he said, "you are very fortunate to be so gifted that you could master all theology in six months. As for myself, I have been studying, and moreover I have been teaching it, for more than fifty years, and I do not yet think that I know it."

The conversation had lasted about half an hour when the officer in waiting announced emphatically, in a loud voice, the King of Holland, the King of Bavaria, and the King of Wurtemberg. "Let them wait!" said the Emperor, dryly; and for nearly a half-hour more they did wait, while he continued to talk to M. Emery on the present situation of the Church and his own plans and projects.

Before leaving him, M. Emery took opportunity to say: "Sire, since your majesty has deigned to read these 'Opuscules de Fleury,' you will doubtless permit me to offer you some *additions* that I have made to the work, and that are the complement of it." Napoleon took the work and laid it on the table, promising to read it.

On leaving the Emperor, M. Emery was respectfully saluted by the great personages whom he met in the neighboring room, who thought they could not honor enough the man to whom the Emperor had granted so long an audience. He, however, withdrew with very different feelings, alarmed at Napoleon's views respecting the Holy See, but thanking God for having aided him to say nothing of which he ought to repent. To his colleagues he said gayly, on his return: "What an honor for me! While the Emperor was granting me an audience, three kings were kept waiting in an anteroom!" But in the depths of his heart he seemed to feel an unwonted gloom and depression, repeating with a sigh the Apos-

tle's words: "*Mori lucrum*" (to die is gain), and, on another occasion: "It would be good to die now." The Abbé Couston, full of life and health, exclaimed: "On the contrary, it is now that it is necessary to live—to live for struggle, for combat, and also for victory, for it is not possible that this state of things can last long." Perhaps he forgot that he spoke to an old veteran of almost eighty years, whose life had been one long struggle and combat, and who, humanly speaking, must have yearned sorely for repose; but M. Emery did, in fact, rouse himself once again for the contest, which was to last till death came.

In 1809 he was placed by Napoleon's command upon a very important commission, composed entirely, except himself and one other priest, of cardinals and bishops, to examine most delicate and pressing questions under most critical circumstances. This one priest, who was his associate, said of him several times that he had never seen so much light, energy and firmness as were displayed by M. Emery on this commission, and he named him "*vir integerrimus*," *a most upright man*. He added that M. Emery had specially shown these qualities in a discussion with the Archbishop of Tours. This prelate having tried, in the gentlest and most persuasive terms, to win over to his side the venerable octogenarian whose judgment by itself swung even in the balance against that of the whole commission, M. Emery answered him ten or twelve times, with as much firmness as respect: "No, Monseigneur, that is not so." He refused bravely to sign his name to the report, which he thought too favorable to the Emperor's ambitious views, and with which he could not agree; and he wrote to his fellow Sulpitian, M. Nagot, these very noble and ever-to-be-remembered words: "All I can tell you is, that I have come forth from this affair without any remorse upon my soul. I believe that God gave me for it the spirit of counsel, but I am sure that in His holy mercy He gave me the spirit of strength."

It was the beginning of the storm which was to darken his closing days. Of course, his courageous refusal came to the Emperor's knowledge. He began now to speak of the Sulpitians with a kind of scorn. "They are people who cling to trifles," he said; but he was met one day with an answer not unworthy of M. Emery's tongue. "Sire," said M. Duvoisin, "there are trifles in all callings, even in the military profession, and yet the success of great things depends on them. If your officers did not carry out the most minute details in their duty, you could not gain so many famous victories." Napoleon had nothing to reply. But in June, 1810, came his abrupt command to transform the seminary of St. Sulpice into a diocesan seminary, and to dismiss the Sulpitian professors as soon as practicable, but to deprive M. Emery immediately of his special functions as superior.

It was the day for ordinations. Not for a moment did the old man lose the peace and tranquility of his soul, long since annealed to loss and pain. Everything apparently went on as usual; but when, on the following Sunday, he gathered his brethren and children around him to say farewell, he disclosed to them the depths of his true and loving heart.

That parting was like the prelude to approaching death. "Nothing more touching," writes M. Méric, "than the scene when this grand old man, on the eve of appearing before God, his locks grown white in the Church's cause and in the preservation of the immortal work of his predecessors, his heart torn, his eyes full of tears, gave to his children, whose sobs interrupted him and answered to his own grief, the last tokens of his deep affection, and the supreme counsels of a heart filled with the Spirit from on high." He then quotes the words of an eye-witness, the Abbé de Mazenod, afterwards Bishop of Marseilles. "The hour struck while he was still speaking, and Gosselin, exact as always in his duty, rose to ring the bell. M. Emery, perceiving this, stopped him, saying these words, memorable indeed from a superior who had for so many years presided over so great a number of community exercises: 'This is the first occasion on which I have ever gone beyond the time and interrupted the order of the rule, and it will be the last.' He finished what he had to say, and still we listened. Emotion was at its height. Those near me begged me to speak. So, rising, I said to him what all hearts there were dictating to me in their silence. I called him by the sweet name of father, and promised him, in behalf of all my fellow-disciples, that all his children would be worthy of their father in the difficult times through which we were passing. I ended by begging him to bless us all before he left us. All knelt, and the holy old man, moved to the depths of his soul, and almost confused, for he was on the point of throwing himself on his knees like us, lifted his hands to heaven and blessed us."

Then he went forth from his seminary home and took up his abode in a little apartment of a house near by, at the corner of the street de Vaurigard. There the faithful Mlle. Jouen came to see him, and with her came his godchild, the angelic Sister Rosalie.

She has left also on record the poverty—we had almost said the destitution—and the austerity of M. Emery's life, at nearly eighty years of age, in that little room where he dwelt an exile beside his seminary home. These things are but additional indications of that firm self-conquest by which he was trained and fitted for the commanding influence that he exerted. And while loading him in his extreme old age with the very trials his noble

nature would most keenly feel—expulsion from his seminary, and then that seminary's downfall and temporary extinction as a Sulpitian house and field of labor—Napoleon still paid open tribute of esteem to the great soul that, as he instinctively felt, despite his pride and state, stood on a level higher than his in its strange and unrivalled power upon him.

On the New Year's day of 1811 the Emperor, walking coldly, without a word for anyone, past the long files of obsequious visitors who had come to offer him their homage and congratulations, paused before the Sulpitian, who was there in his capacity of life-councillor of the university, and blandly asked if this were not M. Emery. The seemingly needless question appears to have been put in order to call attention to the favored individual thus accosted. To the reply in the affirmative the Emperor asked again, with a gracious smile: "Are you eighty years of age?" "Sire," was the reply, "I am nearly that, for I am seventy-nine." "Ah, well, returned the Emperor, "I wish you ten years more."

All those who were present, and to whom the Emperor had not said a word, looked at M. Emery with astonishment, and hastened to congratulate him. "I remember," writes M. Garnier, "that he came to see me after this audience, and said, laughing: 'The Emperor paid me a compliment to-day that no one else received; he wished me not only a happy New Year, but ten happy New Years. I fear, however, that his good wishes will not bring me happiness, but trouble.' That year he died."

But before his death he was to receive one more and a most signal token of Napoleon's opinion of him; he was to give one more and a most shining proof of his heroic virtue and consistent, unswerving uprightness. In February, 1811, the Emperor convoked a commission composed of three cardinals, two archbishops, three bishops, and added to it M. Emery's name. In spite of his extreme repugnance, he yielded, lest his refusal should draw down the imperial wrath on the entire body of Sulpitians throughout France, as in Paris.

The instructions which were to serve as a basis for deliberation were laid before the commission, and were found to contain a demand for their solemn ratification and justification of his conduct in regard to Pope Pius VII. They were of so startling a nature, and so full of harm to the well-being of the Church, that M. Emery could not close his eyes all night, in the bitterness of his grief. Rising early in the morning, he wrote to Cardinal Fesch, to make known to him the impossibility of entering into the Emperor's views, and the necessity of telling him so as soon as possible. He added that the bishops could not admit of any temporizing in so important a matter; and that as for the cardinal

himself, never was firmness more needful for him, even if it should amount to resistance unto blood. This letter produced its effect. The cardinal went at once to his imperial nephew, and represented to him that the bishops could not consent to the propositions made to them by the ministers of public worship, and that if he persisted in urging it, he would meet with insurmountable opposition, and must expect "to make martyrs." All this made a great impression upon Napoleon; but although he changed his method of tactics, he continued to urge upon the commission demands that placed them in a position of extreme embarrassment, and at last he convoked them to a solemn audience in a great hall of the palace of the Tuileries.

It was to be the final and the grandest scene in M. Emery's public life, so far as earthly grandeur goes; and unwittingly the Emperor had prepared a stage for what was to prove to be their last interview and an open display of the mysterious attraction between these two men of extraordinary interest in their separate spheres. To the magnificent palace he had summoned bishops, archbishops, cardinals, councillors of state and great dignitaries of the empire, whose splendid robes, adorned with decorations and insignia that bore witness to imperial honors, attracted the curious gaze. And among them stood the infamous Talleyrand, Prince of Bénévent, traitor and apostate, "with his livery of to-day and his fortune of yesterday," and Emery, the Sulpitian, poor and homeless and plainly clad—his locks whitened and his form bent by his prolonged and glorious combats even more than by the weight of his fourscore years—unshakable in the fearless strength of his faith and irreproachable in the austere simplicity of his virtuous life.

After making this illustrious assemblage wait two hours, the Emperor appeared. A deep silence succeeded to the resounding acclamations that hailed his entrance. He opened the session by a violent harangue against the Pope, whom he accused of unjustly opposing his plans. He enumerated his grievances, enhancing them by threats; and his words were so violent—they betrayed so plainly the bitterness and vehemence of his wrath—that he seemed openly to defy any of those who heard him to dare to contradict him or to defend in his presence the dignity of conscience and the honor of the Church. He manifested plainly the disposition he was in, to proceed to the most extreme measures, in order to conquer the passive but unflinching resistance of the aged pontiff, who at that very hour was paying the price of his apostolic courage in the cruel suffering of a long captivity. It would seem as if a single word would cause the vials of imperial wrath to overflow, and the conqueror of the nations would bid Christian France

to govern herself without a Pope, which, as his hearers only too well knew, would mean that she should then be governed by him.

All present, with one exception, kept silent. "That one, a simple priest, arose" (so writes Cardinal Consalvi) "to save the honor of his priestly state, and dared to tell the truth to the most formidable of the Cæsars. This priest was the Abbé Emery, a man equally to be respected for his learning and his years, who had lived through the evil days of the Revolution without their leaving upon him the slightest taint."

When the Emperor had finished his diatribe against the Pope's authority, of which, he said, the bishops had no need for the government of their churches, he suddenly exclaimed: "M. Emery, what do you think of all that?"

As one reads the words, one's mind reverts to the year 1793 and the Place de la Concorde, and sees a little priestly figure going close up to the guillotine to examine it leisurely in detail, in order to be prepared to mount it bravely if ever the summons came. One recalls the fifteen months in the prisons of the Revolution, and the unshaken peace of him who was termed an angel there. That man was indeed prepared to "stand before kings and not be ashamed." M. Emery, being so directly questioned, glanced first at the bishops, as though asking their permission to act instead of them; then, turning to the Emperor, he spoke. And whether the reader agree with him or not, he cannot fail, as Napoleon and Talleyrand themselves could not, to admire the manner in which he carried on his part in the following very remarkable conversation, which ought, in strict justice, to find place in any history of Napoleon Bonaparte that claims to be at all complete.

An artist would have ample scope for his fancy and his brush, if he strove to portray that scene—the magnificent salon, the fear, amazement, admiration, suspense depicted on the faces, and then the two central figures—the Emperor's well known face and form and gorgeous robes, the Sulpitian's bent and aged figure in its plain, dingy cassock, his venerable face, with dome-like brow, great jaw and piercing eyes; and above all, coming out visibly to sight, that mysterious attraction between these two extraordinary and commanding natures, and the strange power exercised by the unarmed and defenceless priest over the captain of a million braves.

"Sire," said the priest, answering the abrupt, positive question, *What do you think of that?* "I can have no other opinion on this point than that which is contained in the catechism taught by your orders in all the churches of the empire. We read, in several places of this catechism, that the Pope is the visible head of the Church, to whom all the faithful owe obedience as to the suc-

cessor of St. Peter, and according to the express institution of Jesus Christ. Can, then, a body do without its head—that is, without him to whom by divine right it owes obedience?"

"Continue," said the Emperor, briefly; and M. Emery spoke again. "We are obliged in France," he said, "to sustain the four articles of the Declaration of 1682, but it is necessary to receive the entire doctrine as a whole (literally, La doctrine dans son entier). Now, it also says, in the preamble of this declaration, that the primacy of St. Peter and of the Roman pontiff was instituted by Jesus Christ, and that all Christians owe him obedience. Moreover, it is added that the four articles have been decreed, in order to prevent, under pretext of the liberties of the Gallican Church, any attack upon that primacy." Hereupon he entered into some developments to show that even though the four articles might limit the Pope's power on some points, they preserved to him so great and so eminent an authority that no important matter could be determined upon, in regard to dogma or discipline, without his participation; whence he concluded that if a national council were assembled, as the emperor was proposing, this council would have no true value if it were held without the approbation of the Pope.

Vanquished in this matter, Napoleon made not the slightest reply; he contented himself with murmuring in a low tone the single word "*Catechism!*" after which, passing to another point, he said: "Ah, well, I am not contesting the spiritual power of the Pope, since he has received it from Jesus Christ. But Jesus Christ did not give him the temporal power; it was Charlemagne who gave it to him, and, as the successor of Charlemagne, it is my will to take it from him, because he does not know how to make use of it, and because it hinders him in the exercise of his spiritual duties. M. Emery, what do you think of that?"

It was the old objection he had made at Fontainebleau repeated now at the Tuileries. The reply of M. Emery was marked by consummate prudence and self-control. "Sire," he said, "I can have upon that matter no other sentiment than that of Bossuet, whose great authority your majesty respects, and with reason, and from whom you are so often pleased to quote. Now, this great prelate, in his defence of the Declaration of the French clergy, expressly maintains that the independence and complete liberty of the sovereign pontiff are necessary for the free exercise of his spiritual authority throughout the universe and in so great a multiplicity of kingdoms and empires." In support of this he recited the exact text from Bossuet, which he had very accurately in his memory, and particularly these words: "We congratulate not only the Apostolic See, but the universal Church also, on account of the

temporal sovereignty ; and we hope, with all the ardor of our heart, that this sacred principality may remain safe and unharmed in every way."

Napoleon listened with patience, and then spoke again calmly, as he always did to anyone who knew how to keep cool when talking with him. "I do not deny the authority of Bossuet," he said. "All that was true in his time, when Europe had many masters, and it was not suitable that the Pope should be subject to any one sovereign in particular. But where would be the inconvenience if the Pope were subject to me, now that Europe knows no master but myself alone?"

Here, although M. Emery felt some embarrassment lest he might make a reply that would wound the Emperor's pride too keenly, he had presence of mind and courage enough to answer that it might be possible that the inconveniences foreseen by Bossuet would not take place during his majesty's reign, nor perhaps during that of his successor. "But," he added, "your majesty knows as well as I do the history of revolutions. That which exists now cannot always exist, and in that case all the inconveniences foreseen by Bossuet might reappear. It is not well, then, to change an order so wisely established." And, in a grave tone that thrilled the assembly, the aged priest added: "Sire, you are often in battle; you know its dangers. If you were to leave your son fatherless while he is still a child, men might conspire against him, and the Pope, who has always been the protector of the weak, will then perhaps be his only support."

"And I have not the right," demanded the Emperor, "to declare to the Pope that if he does not give canonical instruction to the bishops I will do without him, and avail myself of a provincial council?"

"Never, sire," was the firm response. "The Pope will not make this concession. It would turn his right to institution into a mockery."

Napoleon cast a severe and scornful glance upon the members of the commission. "You were willing, then," he said to them, "to let me commit a gross blunder, persuading me to ask from the Pope a thing that he has no right to grant me!"

Thus ended the session, during which it was noticeable that the old superior of St. Sulpice was almost the only one to whom the Emperor spoke. Rising to retire, he bowed graciously to him, without appearing to pay any attention to the others who were present. He asked one of the bishops, however, if what M. Emery had said about the instructions contained in the Catechism concerning the Pope's authority was actually to be found there. The bishop could, of course, only give an affirmative reply, so that M.

Emery afterwards remarked to M. Garnier that he had taught the Emperor his catechism, which he did not know.

As Napoleon was about to leave the salon, some of the prelates, fearing that he might be displeased with M. Emery's frankness, implored him to excuse the venerable man on account of his advanced age. "You are quite mistaken, gentlemen," said the Emperor. "I am by no means angry with M. Emery. He has spoken like a man who knows what he is about, and that is the way I like men to speak to me. It is true that he does not think as I do, but everyone ought to have the right to his own opinion here." Cardinal Fesch took advantage of the Emperor's favorable dispositions to ask leave for M. Emery to return to his seminary, but Napoleon simply answered, "We shall see."

On leaving the audience-chamber, Talleyrand said to one of the members of the commission: "I knew very well that M. Emery was a man of great ability, but I did not believe that he had so much of it. He has the power to tell the Emperor the plain truth without displeasing him." Napoleon was, in fact, so impressed by the wisdom of the answers made by him to the questions he had put, that when Cardinal Fesch, a few days later, wished to speak with him on ecclesiastical affairs, he received this brusque reply: "Hold your tongue! You are an ignoramus! Where did you learn theology? It is with M. Emery, who does know it, that I shall talk about that."

The fame of what had taken place in the audience at the Tuileries spread abroad, adding a new lustre to the reputation for wisdom and firmness that the well-known Sulpitian already possessed. Some of the circumstances were inserted by Cardinal Pacca in his "Memoirs," and from them he himself conceived the highest esteem for M. Emery, and remained persuaded that Napoleon never would have become the persecutor of the Church had he, from the first, found more firmness in the bishops. It is to be remarked that this opinion has since been adopted by grave writers both of French and of foreign extraction.

Indifferent alike to praise or blame, M. Emery went his way, returning to his humble room with the serenity of a man who sees too near at hand the end of all earthly things to take any further interest in the glory and the honors of earth. "A little later," writes Cardinal Consalvi, "M. Emery was taken ill—perhaps in consequence of the effort he had put upon himself, for he was about eighty years of age; and soon he died, happy in not ending his career before arriving at a point so glorious in the eyes of the world and so meritorious for heaven."

His illness lasted only from Tuesday till Sunday. It was the second Sunday after Easter, called by the French, from the open-

ing words of the Gospel, "The Sunday of the Good Shepherd"—of Him who giveth His life for the sheep. The members of the Sulpitian order in Paris gathered around his bed. In a low voice, and with very great effort, he blessed them in words which tell the true story of his long and eventful career :

"I have lived only for the Seminary and for the Church. They will form the subject of my prayers and wishes even to my last breath. I give you all my blessing."

"Then," writes his biographer, M. Méric, "he fell into a heavy sleep. From time to time a gesture, a look, which still preserved its intelligence, told that the last hour had not yet come, and that he was not yet separated from his beloved children. Then he ceased all exterior communication with this world, and shut himself up in a great silence, interrupted by the sharp sound of his difficult breathing. One would have said that he was climbing painfully a steep mountain, and that his body and soul were making a supreme effort to reach some mysterious summit. All stood there, dumb and dismayed at the sight of a soul striving to break its final bonds and fly away, while the trembling house of the body was falling into ruin. They threw themselves on their knees and began the prayers for the dying. Finally, M. Pignier, who was watching every movement, bent once more over the dying father and listened intently; then, deeply moved, he said: 'It is finished. We can recite the *De Profundis*.'"

Very soon after Cardinal Fesch entered the room. He had come to visit once more the man who had dared to speak to him, as well as to his illustrious nephew, the words of fearless truth, and also, in the cardinal's case, of wise spiritual advice and intimate affection. He came too late.

Grieved even to tears, he said a prayer, and then made his way to the palace, where he said to the Emperor: "Sire, I have bad news for you. M. Emery is dead."

"I am very sorry," exclaimed the Emperor. "I am very sorry. He was a wise man; he was an ecclesiastic of distinguished merit. It is necessary to have extraordinary honors for him, and he must be interred at the Pantheon."

The cardinal, who knew how contrary to the spirit of the Sulpitians such obsequies would be, informed the Emperor that the burial-place of M. Emery was already selected at the country-house of the seminary, and that it was proper he should rest among his children, who would be inconsolable if they were separated from him. Napoleon did not then insist upon his idea being carried out. The cardinal told this incident to M. Duclaux.

The aged face of the dead priest resumed, immediately after his painful death, its expression of sweet serenity. There was to be seen upon it the peace and tranquility of one who rests at last after long labors ended well. They bore him from his seminary in Paris to the quiet cemetery at Issy, and placed above his tomb the splendid Latin epitaph composed by his friend, the Abbé Hémey d'Auberive, who said of him, weeping: "I lose to-day the friend of fifty-eight years." The severest critic cannot deny that the epitaph is a faithful picture of this old and fearless veteran of the Cross.

Hic Jacet

JACOBUS ANDREAS EMERY

Seminarii Sancti Sulpitii Superior nonus,  
Universitatis imperialis consiliarius perpetuus,  
Vir optimi ingenii insignisque virtutis:

In vultu benignitas,

In ore sermo ad flectendos animos appositus,

In scriptis doctrina sponte fluens,

Exquisitumque judicium,

Prisci moris et avitæ disciplinæ tenacissimus,

In consiliis sagax et prudens,

In intricatis solers,

In regiminis arte præcipuus,

In adversis fortis et invictus,

Integer in omnibus.

Episcopalibus infulis pluries repulsis,

Elegit abjectus esse in domo Dei sui:

Baetæ Mariæ virginis famulus addictissimus,

Sponsæque Christi ecclesiæ, cui totus vixit,

Miles indefessus,

Bonum certamen certans obiit,

28 Aprilis, 1811, Ætatis 79.

So went, to meet the King of kings, the only man Napoleon feared; a man of whom it can be truly said that, throughout the sanguinary scenes of the French Revolution and the critical years of the First Empire, *he feared God, and knew no other fear.*

S. L. EMERY.

## THE OLD FAITH AND THE NEW WOMAN.

GOOD causes are commonly ruined by bad advocacy, and that in two ways: by the indiscretion of sincere supporters and by the malice of the self-interested and insincere. Nothing is more familiar to us in the history of progress than to see some particular member wrenched away violently from the organic body of truth, built up into an all-sufficing philosophy, and carried to extravagant lengths, being no longer limited and checked by principles co-ordinate or superior. As a lie has no subsistence in itself, but must be hung on a framework of truth, its success varies according as the truth it rests on is more evident, and the distortion it adds to it more subtle and imperceptible.

It is a necessary result of the limitations of the human mind that the whole body of truth, or of any department of truth, cannot at once be apprehended in all its distinctness and unity, but must first be received in the gross, and then noticed in detail part by part, and finally grasped once more in its entirety by an intelligent synthesis. And the means by which this subjective development is usually effected is everywhere the same, whether we speak of the development of Christian doctrine or of philosophical truth. Some detail heretofore overlooked and neglected, not without hurt, forces itself into notice. It proves to be a solution of many difficulties and inconsistencies. Hasty thinkers regard it as an entirely new discovery, and suppose that because it was not explicitly recognized and emphasized before, therefore it was not recognized at all, or was even denied. If it solves so many difficulties, it is confidently predicted that it will solve all. It is not only true, but it is the whole truth, and the old faith and philosophy is indiscriminately condemned. In time, however, the limits of the new doctrine begin to be felt, and it has to be squeezed and twisted to evade the difficulties which present themselves and to meet all the problems it has undertaken to solve; and eventually the maimed and mangled theory is abandoned in favor of some still newer intellectual panacea. But, meantime, the Church, in mere self-defence, has been forced to look within and to look without, and, comparing the new heresy with the old faith, to recognize in the former the perversion of a truth long hidden within her own bosom, but of which now she becomes for the first time explicitly conscious; and while those who move on the topmost path of thought are already wild in the excitement of some new theory,

she is quietly gathering up and appropriating whatever was worth keeping from the *débris* of the last. Hence, if she always drags a little behind the extreme thought of the day, it is in the company of truth; and if the suggestions of progress and healthy reform often originate with her enemies, it is she that corrects, adopts and profits by them. Indeed, it is almost necessary that the Church's attitude towards these revolutionary movements should at first be one of hostility, that her attention should be fixed on the exaggerations and distortions of the truth rather than on the truth itself; for it is usually by the clashing of these excesses with her own teaching that she is roused to interest herself in the matter. Were she to throw herself headlong into sympathy with the cause, approving what is sound, tolerating or ignoring what is unsound, she would be untrue to her mission in lending the force of her authority to increase the impetus of a misdirected movement. Her first duty is to secure accuracy of aim and direction, and, until then, to maintain an attitude not merely of neutrality, but often of opposition and hostility. Thus, all through her history she exhibits the same apparent inconsistency, first rejecting and then accepting the results of progressive thought; yet what she rejects is not the truth, but the lie with which it is entangled; and what she accepts is the pure gold purged from its dross.

This is well illustrated in regard to the results of modern physical science, as well as of political, social and moral philosophy. As long as physicists push their principles and methods into other spheres of truth and try to usurp an unwarranted supremacy for their experimental criterion, the Church has no ears for their discoveries, so intent is she on their fallacies. Similarly, a democracy based on the principles of Rousseau, a socialism which appeals to those of Lasalle and Marx, must find her an enemy; and it is only after she has registered her protest on the face of history that she begins to sift the matter and to inaugurate a counter-reformation.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find numbers of narrower and less liberal-minded Catholics in strong opposition to such counter-reformations, and to the favorers thereof. It seems to them that the Church is in danger of making a false peace with her old enemies. Not discerning the chaff from the grain, all criticism is, to their mind, a concession to rationalism; all political and social reform, to communism and anarchy; all change, a condemnation of the past.

It cannot be denied that the "New Woman" in her extreme type is an abomination to Catholic instincts, nor that the movement which has culminated in her production—(we trust it has

culminated)—is animated by many false principles for which J. S. Mill is largely responsible, although they have been considerably developed of late years. In a disbelief in the sacramental and divine nature of marriage; in a false conception of liberty; in an exaggerated individualism—all the fruits of the Reformation—we find the seeds of this movement which needed nothing but time and a favorable environment to germinate. It is only when, in the light of history, we trace out the progress of a false principle into all its ramifications, finding it, where we least expect, under the most diverse manifestations; when we see how endlessly fertile of evil it is, that we understand the Church's violent intolerance for a lie in any form, and the acrimony with which she insists on distinctions and subtleties which in themselves or in their immediate consequences seem utterly insignificant—mere logomachies and pedantries of the school. As it was only the political evils of the French monarchy which brought the principles of the "philosophers" to a practical and evident conclusion, and the modern industrial crisis which called non-Catholic sociology into light; so it was the pressure of competition and the struggle for existence which first gave public prominence to the question of woman's rights and wrongs—what she might do and what she might not do—and elicited the rationalistic solution of Mill and his followers.

For, on rationalist principles, what justification could be offered for the ancient superstition of man's superiority? The story of the creation of Eve; of the primitive and divine institution of marriage; the belief in its elevation to the dignity of a sacrament typical of the relation of the Church to Christ her head and master—all this is relegated to the region of myths—myths invented to favor the divine right of oppressors. Was it not the old story of slavery over again; of the "natural" superiority of the triumphant white over the black race, of the divine right of conquerors, or of the political and social oppression of the poor? If "each is to count for one, and none for more than one," let the woman count for one, and the man for no more. Is not the liberation and equality of woman a necessary corollary of the equality of all men, and of the great principle of individualism and independence which we owe to the Protestant Reformation? If she is now mentally inferior, is it not the result of centuries of injustice, and of unequal opportunities? If she is physically weaker, such inferiority might have had social significance in barbaric times when brute-force ruled, and when might was right; but is it to be considered in these days, when mind governs the world? Besides, has not this inferiority been exaggerated in fact, and may not the emancipation of woman from conventional re-

striction and her admittance to athletic competitions give some truth to Amazonian fables? And as for the duties and impediments of maternity, there is no reason on rationalist principles why any woman should encumber herself with them more than is just convenient, even if she chosés to enter into the married state—which of course she will only do on a footing of perfect equality with her copartner; for there is to be no question of obedience or dependence beyond that dependence which in every equal and bilateral contract ties one party to the other until it is solved by mutual consent, or by the unfaithfulness of either to the substantial conditions.

This is, in brief, the logical justification of the "New Woman's" position on rationalist grounds—and logically there is no fault to find with it. And of course we do not mean that all New Women are rationalists, but only that, if consistent, they should be rationalists. Many of them favor the movement merely as a freak of fashion; others, because they see much to be said for it, and yet fail to see the full consequences that are involved in it; comparatively few from an intelligent and deliberate acceptance of the entire rationalist creed.

The same principle which tends to dissolve the barrier between classes and masses in point of political power and social privileges must eventually work itself out in the greatest possible equalization of the sexes. Indeed when women get political power into their own hands as they are bound to do, they will strive to hasten that consummation still more rapidly. The New Woman's cause is bound up with the wider one of individualism in practical philosophy, and of rationalism or "naturalism," as we now call it, in speculative. To estimate the strength of that cause is not our present concern; but it cannot fail to be furthered greatly by this accession of female influence, formerly enlisted almost entirely on the other side.

Now, in contrasting the New Woman theory with the teaching of the Catholic religion—which, according to what is, in its way, a true conception of DeLamennais, is only the common sense of mankind supernaturalized—we must carefully discriminate between the immutable principles of the Church's teaching and the local and transitory forms in which those principles are embodied, and by which they are sometimes obscured. Just as we distinguish between the beliefs of Catholics and Catholic belief, so we may not conclude that the condition of woman in any Catholic country or at any particular epoch is the product of Catholic principles unless we can clearly trace the connection, for the leaven of an idea works its way slowly. The Church will tolerate much, and will connive at many inevitable evils attendant on imperfect stages

of social development, if only she can secure the essentials of religion. She "has many things to say" to the semi-pagan and semi-barbarian, but they "cannot bear them yet." The natural growth of subjective truth cannot be hurried, else it will have no deep root; and this is as true of the collective, as of the individual mind.

It need hardly be stated that the two principles of individualism and rationalism are essentially uncatholic and anti-catholic. Although the Church abhors the socialist extreme which enslaves the unit to the multitude, making society an end in itself and not a means to the good of its several members, yet she holds firmly to the truth that it is only in and through society—domestic, civil or ecclesiastical—that personality can be duly developed. In the mystical body of Christ she finds the archetype of all society, whose unity she accordingly concludes to be that of a living organism, and not—as Rousseau—that of an artificial aggregate of independent units, bound to one another by the force of self-interest. "Nemo sibi vivit," "None for himself," is the law of the former association; "each for himself" is the law of the latter. Together with this conception of society as a natural organism goes the doctrine of the right of authority and the duty of obedience. If the subjection of members to the head, of parts to the whole, is demanded by nature, it is therefore commanded by that Personal Power in and above nature. Hence obedience to lawful authority becomes a duty to God, and the right of that authority is, in some sense, divine. On the other hand, if all society originates in a free contract, whereof the motive is self-interest; if no unit cares for the universal good except so far as it is a means to his own isolated advantage, then in submitting to self-imposed restrictions eventually one obeys oneself; which is only an indirect way of saying he follows his own will and not the will of another. In a word, with the artificial or contract-theory of society, the very notion of obedience must vanish.

As, in the Catholic view, the family is the simplest social unit, so the conjugal association is the simplest and germinal form of the family. In that society of two, as in all society, the distinction between head and body, ruler and ruled, is essential, because where a conflict of wills in morally indifferent matters is possible, social life requires a power of determining and ending such controversy; a right of decision on the one hand and of acquiescence on the other. We say "morally indifferent matters," for where it is a question of right and wrong and of God's law, the decision of a higher court has already been given. This right of social superiority in that narrowest of societies the Catholic religion has always attributed to the husband. She has regarded it as the postulate of

nature, and therefore as the command of God. She finds it confirmed by revelation in the account of the primitive and divine institution of marriage, and still more in the restoration of that institution by Christ to more than its pristine dignity; in its elevation to the rank of a sacrament signifying and effecting a relation between husband and wife analogous to that which subsists between Christ the Head, and the Church—His body—the archetype of all social organism. “As the Church is subject to Christ, so let women be to their husbands in all things;” for “the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church.” Obedience in all matters pertaining to that society, and when nothing is ordered contrary to any higher authority, is the wife’s duty; and to command in such matters and under such limits is the husband’s right. And it is not, as contract-theories conceive it, a right which the unmarried woman possesses over herself and in marriage gives over to her husband, as she might give over her fortune, but one which springs into existence for the first time together with the contract. As I cannot obey myself, so neither can I command or force myself; and, not having that power myself, I cannot give it to another, though I can posit the conditions on which he receives it. In every free promise I put myself in another’s power; yet the power exercised over me is not and was not mine, but it is the power of *truth*, or of that Law-giver who forbids me to lie and commands me to fulfil my words. In this sense, all lawful authority is divine, even as truth is.

It is, however, important to notice the distinction between social or official superiority and personal—a distinction ever insisted on by the Church in the interests of liberty. Just as, in her ministers and priests, she bids us discern between the man and his ecclesiastical office, and assures us that the personal unfitness of the minister in no way affects the validity of his ministrations, so, in the question of jurisdiction, ecclesiastical, civil or domestic, she admonishes those in office not to credit themselves with personal superiority, or to govern, as it were, in right of possessing greater wisdom, or holiness, or ability than their subjects; nor to imagine that an appointment necessarily carries with it an infallible guarantee of aptitude, present, past or future. Thus Ignatius of Loyola, who expresses the common doctrine of the Church in a form peculiarly distressing to the pseudo-liberal mind, says in his notorious Letter on Obedience: “For indeed it is not as though he were endued and enriched with prudence or benevolence or other divine gifts of whatever kind that a superior is to be obeyed, but only on this account that he holds the place of God and exercises His authority who says: ‘He that heareth you heareth me.’” The tyranny of individualism in government is altogether opposed

to Catholic theory; and we cannot conclude at once that, because the husband is superior to the wife, therefore the man is superior to the woman; but, at most, that there is in the man, as such, a certain aptitude for that particular office which is not found in the woman. Of that aptitude we shall speak presently. Let it suffice, by way of illustration of our last remark, to refer to the Catholic veneration for the Holy Family of Nazareth, when St. Joseph, as the husband of Mary, held the office of superior over one who, in the Church's estimation, was almost immeasurably his better in light and wisdom and divine grace. Official superiority, therefore, does not involve personal superiority any more than personal superiority in one point or more means superiority all round.

Still less is it in keeping with the Catholic conception that the subjection of the wife should be slavish or the government of the husband despotic. For matrimony is a true "society," and the wife is *socia*, and not *serva*; that is to say, she, as a person, is both intellectually and morally her husband's companion and friend, and the end of their association is not the repression but the fuller development of her personality. And this is the Church's ideal of government everywhere, in home and state, so far as men are sufficiently imbued with unselfish and social instincts to profit by it. The law and the spirit of fear is for the infancy of races; the Gospel and the spirit of love for their maturity. Where the less ideal state of domestic society prevails, the Church may tolerate it as expedient or necessary under the circumstances, but she is never satisfied with it.

Now all this is wholly unintelligible if we accept the contract-theory of society in general and extend it to the matrimonial bond. There is, in that view, as little assignable reason why the wife's place in the association should be one of inferiority as why, in a partnership of any two free individuals for a common advantage, one should preside over the other; and where there is no authority there is no place for obedience.

Thus an American advocate of Woman's Rights, in a chapter headed *Obey*,<sup>1</sup> tells us how he protested one day to a clergyman against the "unrighteous pledge to obey," used in the Protestant marriage service:

"'I hope,' I said, 'to live to see that word expunged from the Episcopal service, as it has been from that of the Methodists.'"

"'Why?' he asked. 'Is it because you know they will not obey, whatever their promise?'"

"'Because they ought not,' I said.

"'Well,' said he, after a few moments' reflection, and looking up frankly, 'I do not think they ought.'"

It is not the first time that an Episcopalian clergyman has differed frankly from St. Paul. The writer goes on to say: "Whoever is pledged to obey is technically and literally a slave, no matter how many roses surround the chains"—from which we must conclude that soldiers and sailors, civil servants and all subjects are slaves, or else that they are perfectly free, morally and physically, to do as they like in everything. Finally he says: "Make the marriage-tie as close as Church or State can make it, but let it be equal and impartial. That it may be so, the word *obey* must be abandoned or made reciprocal." The idea of "reciprocal obedience" is hard to grasp, but, as far as we understand it, it does not augur well for domestic peace. But, in truth, all obedience is to a superior; and just so far as there is equality, obedience is impossible. In fact, on individualist principles the matrimonial relation is essentially different from what it is conceived to be, not only by Christianity, but by the hitherto unsophisticated reason of mankind. There are still, even for the equalitarian, certain prudential motives which make monogamy desirable and divorce undesirable within given limits, but those limits are soon reached.

It is absurd and futile for would-be orthodox writers to contend against the inevitable weakening of the marriage-bond, which is the necessary result of certain false social principles, unless they are prepared to repudiate those principles altogether. If all authority, civil and ecclesiastical, is only by delegation from the people, with whom it rests inalienably—if it is merely self-interest that binds the members of society to one another; if obedience is only an indirect following of one's own will, subjected to that of another freely and revocably—then the self-interested association of man and woman must be conceived in the same way, and the word "obey" either expunged from the Protestant marriage-service or explained away. Indeed, we must freely admit that the New Woman, or even a newer, who may yet be revealed, is a logical outcome, a necessary product of equalitarianism. That philosophy tends to deny any difference between the sexes that is not strictly physiological. It refuses to admit that, morally and intellectually, they are complementary one of another; that the perfect humanity, the complete mind and character is divided between them; that human parentage is not merely animal, but includes the mental and moral formation of the offspring, to which both parents are instrumental and necessary each in their own way. Beyond the limits of physiology it regards all differences and inequalities as artificial and iniquitous, and it tends logically to the eventual abolition of matrimony in any recognizable sense of the term. It is only those extremists who maintain an essential superiority of woman over

man, and who would gladly see the numbers of the hated sex restricted to the base necessities of society, who have no *locus standi* according to equalitarian principles.

## II.

And now we may inquire in what, precisely, consists that inequality which, in domestic society, gives the husband headship over the wife. Those who make no distinction between what is and what must be, between what must be and what ought to be, will freely grant that in the state of rude savagery the wife depends on the superior physical force and liberty of the husband for protection, and that such dependence puts the reins into his hands. But as social evolution relieves her of this dependence more and more, it may be asked, What basis remains for the old relationship? If woman is not intellectually and morally inferior and dependent, why should she be the one to submit? Now it is most necessary to observe that "superior" is here a relative term, implying some end to be secured. The end in question is the government of the domestic society, the government of the members only in matters pertaining to their common good, and in no others. For example, when we agree that in the savage state the man is more fit to govern the house or wigwam than the woman, we mean that he is superior in fighting power, being less physically encumbered. We do not mean that even physiologically he is a superior being all round, but that, having some attributes which she has not, he can secure an end which she cannot—just as, in many matters, she is superior in virtue of capacities which he has not.

If, then, woman's subjection in more developed domestic society is founded on a certain intellectual or moral inferiority, it does not mean that she is all round intellectually or morally inferior to man, but only other than man; it does not mean that she is less fit for high intellectual or moral attainments, but only less fit for government, less endowed, as a rule, with the qualities positive and negative, required for that trust. Whether those qualities are of all others the most admirable and enviable may be questioned. Mr. Kidd,<sup>1</sup> discussing the value of intellect as a factor in social evolution, shows fairly well how far more important are the stolid and earthy qualifications to which the Teutonic races owe their steady progressiveness, and the absence of which makes free government unworkable in Celtic nations. Where idealism, imagination and emotion prevail very widely, they are fatal to that stability which is needed for social order and growth. It was with a fine humor

---

<sup>1</sup> *Social Evolution.*

that Plato looked forward to the rule of philosophers as an ideal government; nor should we choose a civil president on account of the fervor of his piety or the sublimity of his political conceptions, although allowing these gifts to be far superior to an insight into the theory of taxation. What, then, is this peculiar characteristic which naturally fits man for the headship in domestic society? Aquinas tells us: "There are two kinds of subjection, servile and domestic, or civil. The latter is the kind of subjection whereby the woman is by nature subject to the man *because of the greater rational discretion which man naturally possesses.*" Mr. D. S. Lilly, who also quotes this passage [Shibboleths, p. 168] and who takes a rather severer view of woman's deficiency than ourselves, writes, in the same chapter: "Taking women in general, it may be truly said that in them sentiment predominates over sense; imagination over reason; that in the logical and scientific faculties they are vastly inferior to men; that their emotions are stronger while their will is weaker; that they are markedly deficient in the power of comprehending truth and justice under the pure form of principles and ideas, apart from persons and things." This sounds a heavier indictment than it really is, for all these deficiencies are but the inseparable price of gifts of whose value it is not easy to form a comparative estimate. Sentiment and sense may be antagonistic, but who shall say which, in the absence of the other, is the better qualification? If vivid imagination disturbs the slow workings of cold reason, it is the necessary condition of quick intuitive intellect?

It is hard to say whether emotion without will or will without emotion is the more objectionable perversion of human nature; and perhaps truth and justice may be judged as falsely, or more from the abstract as from the concrete. In truth, to quote Mr. Lilly again, "The force of fanaticism could go no further than to deny the existence of a sexual character. *Das Weib kein Mann ist*, says the German proverb. 'Woman is not undeveloped man, but diverse,' . . . the perfection of the man is not the perfection of the woman. The ideals of masculine and feminine excellence are different." For, indeed, the whole human character in its adequate perfection is put into commission between the two sexes. Morally and intellectually, no less than physiologically, they are complementary; and that not merely as companions or associates, but as parents and educators of their offspring. It is on this natural and necessary diversity of mental and moral character that matrimonial society is founded. But when we reflect on the qualities needed for direction and government, chief among them seems to be that "*discretio rationis*" or reasoning discernment of which Aquinas speaks—a power of taking a cold, impartial, abstract

view of things; a gift immensely useful, if not very attractive. Not, of course, that every man possesses this pre-eminently, but that he does so normally in so far as the masculine character is duly developed in him. Where, on the other hand, it is the wife who excels in this talent, there usually results a disturbance of due domestic harmony, or else a complete inversion of the matrimonial relationships, which confirms the theory of Aquinas very satisfactorily. It is not, however, the actual possession of this reasoning discernment that constitutes or measures the husband's right to govern, any more than the authority of any other ruler depends on his aptitude. The presumption of such aptitude is the implicit condition of his designation, but the designation is not invalidated by the falseness of the presumption.

The scope of marital government, as we have already said, is confined to matters concerning the common domestic good, and the subjection of the wife is not servile but social; "for the servant knoweth not what his master doeth," but the wife is governed in domestic matters, not despotically, without reference to her views and inclinations, but politically, as a person, and with the greatest deference to those views and inclinations which is compatible with the common good. *Nemo sibi vivit*, None for himself, is, as we have said, the ideal of all Christian society. The husband is not made for the wife nor the wife for the husband, but each for the twain.

It will be already evident that there is nothing in the Catholic view favoring a belief in the *general* intellectual or moral inferiority of woman; and how perfectly in accord with the mind of Christianity is her highest development in both respects will presently appear. Of course, we make a distinction between *necessary* and *actual* inferiority. The former may be repudiated very plausibly, the latter cannot. As we have said, the division of labor and of domestic cares which was needed in rude social states, and which is now, and perhaps always will be, needed among the un-leisured classes, requires for the majority of young girls a training which will fit them for their probable after-work; a training which concentrates the mind on small practical details, and which tends, apart from precautionary measures, to produce narrowness, except so far as religion raises the mind to greater and more universal conceptions. Indeed, the very existence of the movement for woman's intellectual emancipation is a confession of an actual and wide-spread inferiority. Again, it may be taken for granted that the unnatural will never so far prevail but that the majority of women will always be involved in the cares of maternity. This, as a heavy tax not only on the time but on the physical energy necessary for severe intellectual work, will put them at a serious

disadvantage. In a word, equality of opportunity, which is essential to fair competition, can never be accorded to that same majority, owing to conditions fixed, not by custom, or by male tyranny, but by nature.

But those who would contend for an all-round essential inferiority of intellect on the part of women have a very difficult thesis to prove, for the simple reason that all their instances are met either by denying equality of opportunity, or by the contention that diversity of intellectual gifts is not the same as inferiority. In proportion as equal opportunities are given from the first, we see everywhere a practical refutation of their view.

How much the Catholic religion, which exalts a Woman to the highest place in creation, favors and furthers her intellectual and moral development and ignores any such essential difference is plain from a retrospect of the past. Let me quote the results of an admirable article in the "Catholic World" for June, 1875, none the less appropriate because written by a woman in reply to Mr. Gladstone's sneer to the effect that the conquests of the Catholic Church in England were "chiefly among women," and therefore of no account. After noting the homage done to woman's intellectual power by the religions of Greece and Rome in the worship of a woman as the goddess of wisdom, and patroness of just and humane warfare; in the cultus of Vesta, of the Muses, of the Fates, of the Graces, and in the honoring of such names as Rhea, Alcestris, Ariadne, Alcione and so forth, the article goes on to notice her place in the Old Testament as exemplified in the prophetesses and wives of the patriarchs; in Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel, Miriam, Deborah, Ruth, Esther, and many others. Then we are reminded how it was among women that Christ found his most numerous, apt, and constant disciples when on earth, thus coming under the lash of Mr. Gladstone's sarcasm. St. Paul speaks of the women who labored with him in the Gospel. Timothy learnt the Scriptures from Lois and Eunice. St. Thecla<sup>1</sup> was skilled in profane and sacred science and philosophy, and excelled in the various branches of polite literature. St. Apollonia preached the faith at Alexandria and converted many by her eloquence. St. Catharine devoted herself to the study of philosophy, especially of Plato, and confuted the ablest Pagan philosophers of her day. She is honored as the patroness of learning and eloquence and of scholastic theology, and art represents her as the Christian *Urania*. After remarking that "the increasing demand which we have on every side for a more substantial and scholarly training of the sex does not look forward to that which they never had, but backward

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul's disciple.

to what they have lost or abandoned," the writer reminds us how it was St. Macrina who taught Sts. Basil and Gregory; how Sts. Cosmas and Damian were instructed by Theodora. "Even as early as the second century," writes a distinguished scholar, "the zeal of religious women for letters excited the bile and provoked the satire of the enemies of Christianity." St. Fulgentius was educated by his mother, who made him learn Homer and Menander by heart. St. Paula stimulated St. Jerome to some of his greatest writings, and St. Eustochium was a faultless Hebrew scholar. St. Chrysostom dedicates seventeen of his letters to St. Olympias; and St. Marcella's acquirements won her the title of the "glory of the Roman ladies." The convents of England in the seventh and eighth centuries vied with the monasteries in letters. St. Gertrude was skilled in Greek, and it was a woman who introduced the study of Greek into the monastery of St. Gall. St. Hilda was consulted on theology by bishops assembled in council. Queen Editha, wife of St. Edward the Confessor, taught grammar and logic. St. Boniface was the teacher of a brilliant constellation of literary women.<sup>1</sup> We are told of women who were familiar with the Greek and Latin fathers; of an abbess who wrote an encyclopedia of all the science of her day; of a nun whose Latin poems and stanzas were the marvel of the learned; of the injunction of the Council of Cloveshoe (747) that abbesses should diligently provide for the education of their nuns; of the labors of Lioba in conjunction with St. Boniface; of a convent school whose course included Latin and Greek, Aristotle's philosophy, and the liberal arts; of women in the papal university of Bologna eminent in canon law, medicine, mathematics, art, literature; of Prosperzia de' Rossi, who taught sculpture there; of Elena Cornaro, a doctor at Milan; of Plautilla Brizio, the architect of the chapel of St. Benedict at Rome. In the eighteenth century we find women taking their degrees in jurisprudence and philosophy at the papal universities. In 1758 we have Anna Mazzolina professing anatomy at Bologna, and Maria Agnese appointed by the Pope to the chair of mathematics. Novella d'Andrea taught canon law for ten years at Bologna, and a woman succeeded Cardinal Mezzofanti as professor of Greek. Still more abundant and overwhelming is the evidence for woman's moral and spiritual equality with man in the Church's esteem. If fortitude is in question, we have Sts. Thecla, Perpetua, Felicity, Agnes, Lucy, Agatha, Cecilia, Apollonia, Catherine, and innumerable hosts of women who faced the torments of martyrdom. If men have forsaken their homes for the Gospel's sake in their thousands, women have done so in their tens of

---

<sup>1</sup> "Valde eruditæ in liberali scientia."

thousands, though for them the wrench, as a rule, is far more violent and painful. In self-denial, in austerity, in patient endurance, in silence, in unselfish devotion to Christ's poor, in all that is rightly supposed to demand the highest degree of self-mastery, they have shown themselves, if not superior, at least fully equal to the other sex.

If the number of men-saints exceeds that of women, it must be recollected that the canonized represent but a handful of the saints, and chiefly those whose sanctity was notorious and before the public gaze; a fact which lessens the chances for the official recognition of female sanctity. For the same reason it is observable how far more frequent is the canonization of bishops than of simple priests, although no one could suppose that saintly priests were less numerous than saintly bishops, considering the numerical proportion of one order to the other. Again, it may be plausibly contended that sanctity in men is more evidently miraculous and out of the common than in women, who in a sense are naturally devout and spiritual-minded.

It would be tiresome to enumerate the religious orders and congregations founded and ruled by women. Indeed, the extent to which the Church has entrusted women with jurisdiction and right of government would seem opposed to the doctrine of Aquinas, referred to above, were it not that this jurisdiction was never, or at least very rarely, exercised over communities of men, and was usually dependent on higher authority vested in bishops or prelates.

In the light of all this, it is impossible to deny that where the Church has her way, and is not trammelled by local prejudices, she desires the fullest possible mental and moral development of women compatible with the discharge of the social duties required by nature and God's law. Here, as among men, the organization of society forbids, and will always forbid, absolute equality of opportunity, capacity and obligation. But it is the aim of sane progress to eliminate all unjust and unreasonable inequalities, and to secure the least possible waste of those spiritual energies in which the true power and wealth of every society consists. Nor must we suppose that it is only in the leisured and unmarried that the Catholic religion desiderates culture. The Church knows far too well the power and influence of the wife and mother not to see that their elevation means the elevation of both husband and children, and that eventually it is they who give the moral tone to the whole community. Woman is naturally the guardian of the spiritual wealth of the family, and for that trust, especially in these days, mere piety, which is not also educated and intelligent, is of little avail. The first formation of the mind is from the mother, and

the impressions which she leaves are indelible. It may truly be said that whatever the Christian religion has done for the elevation of public morals it has done through the instrumentality of woman. A brief study of Mr. Devas's admirable little book on "Family Life" will confirm what perhaps no one with any knowledge of human history will dispute, and prove that where woman is debased and basely thought of, there, in proportion, public morality is at a low ebb. This is the vein of truth which runs through that otherwise very wild and ridiculous though well-written book, "The Heavenly Twins," and makes one wish that the authoress's power had been equal to her aspirations.

We must not, then, credit the Catholic religion with the sentiments of certain more or less pious writers of the male sex who consider an oriental contempt of women to be a great point of virtue; who insist much on the priority of Eve's share in our racial disaster, forgetting that theology regards it as quite insignificant compared with that of Adam, and more than abundantly counterbalanced by the part of Mary in our redemption; who look upon all the immorality in the world as an evil brought upon poor innocent man by that diabolical creature which God made to be a "helpmeet for him"—a little touch of manicheism, such as induces some to regard wine as essentially demoniacal because men choose to drink too much of it. A moment's reflection would show that it is in the reverence and not in the contempt of woman that purity must look for its only reliable safeguard; and it is with this in her mind that the Church counsels a devotion to the Virgin mother in the interests of that virtue.

As regards the admission of woman to the occupations at present monopolized by men, it is well to observe that of the existing restrictions some few are natural and necessary; many desirable in woman's own interest; many, no doubt, now purely customary and conventional, though not without reason originally. It is certainly a pleasure to think that at least one-half of humanity is exempted from the risk of moral and physical degradation attendant on many occupations and callings in the political, civil and industrial world. If some restrictions are merely customary, still customs are to be respected, and public feeling must not be rudely shocked. The majority, being ruled in their tastes and opinions not by reason, as they suppose, but by tradition and imitation, will be equally opposed to all innovation, reasonable or unreasonable. When the opposition is unreasonable, customs must be unformed in the same way as they are formed, namely, by single acts gradually multiplied. No city-bred person is now shocked by the lady-cyclist, yet she who first dared public opinion in the matter must have abounded in brass. Fortunately there

are always such to be met with; and while we need not admire their forwardness, we must allow their social usefulness and necessity. Similarly, in the matter of dress, what is "unheard of" is not necessarily wicked or immodest. From the days of St. Paul to the present the Church has protested against that species of "irrational costume" which is one of the most persistent survivals of barbarism, based on the supposition that woman's power with man depends solely on her appeal to his senses, and not on her appeal to his soul. But why the "New Woman" should studiously imitate the latest horrors of male attire is a mystery which can be solved only by supposing that her bitterest vituperations veil a secret reverence for man, the monster, and a deference to his æsthetic and practical judgment, or else that inconsistency is not altogether peculiar to the weak-minded women of the past.

In conclusion, if we contrast the ideal of the Christian lady with that of the "New Woman"—one the fair fruit of sound reason enlightened by Catholic faith, the other the base issue of crude equalitarianism and sense-philosophy—there is little difficulty in seeing that the former conception is strong and full of energies yet to be developed, while the latter contains within itself the principles of its own decay and death. The downfall of the family, the profanation of marriage, means the downfall and profanation of woman. It is only in virtue of a faint survival of chivalry—the fruit of Christianity—that the "New Woman," whether she likes to allow it or not, can elbow her way to the front as she does. If man is ever rebarbarized by the withdrawal of the softening influence of home, if woman becomes nothing more to him than a competitor in the general struggle for wealth, she will eventually be forced down to that degradation which has always been her lot under the reign of pure selfishness and brute force. If it is her greater unselfishness which has caused her so much suffering in the past, it has also been the cause of her great power for good. Selfishness is brute force; unselfishness a spiritual force. She can never compete with man if the contest is to be one of brute force. It is the Church which has raised her, and, through her, raised the world, though both processes are still struggling but slowly towards completion.

GEORGE TYRRELL, S.J.

### In Memoriam.

---

THE VERY REV. AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT, D.D.


WITH profound sorrow we have to chronicle the demise of the patriarchal head of the Paulist Congregation, Very Rev. Father Hewit. It is rarely that the Church in this country sustains a loss of the peculiar kind involved in the passing away of this distinguished priest. He belongs to that new departure in the life of Catholicism in America which nearly synchronized with the rise of the Oxford movement in England. The movement here originated with a few zealous converts, and at its outset was headed by that remarkable man, Father Hecker, who combined so much of the practical spirit of modern America with the exalted mysticism of the Friars Minors. It seemed to these zealous men by no means impossible to bring the Catholic Church in America into living touch with the masses of the people, and at the same time present her claims so irrefutably before all, that only mere obstinacy and self-interest could refuse to see its truth and beauty. Father Hecker's life was devoted to this glorious task. Father Hewit, who inherited his mantle when he was called to join his Divine Master, labored for its accomplishment incessantly too, though not perhaps by the same methods. The temperaments of the two men were dissimilar, but they sought for the same parallax from their respective intellectual and emotional bases.

There was very little of the dreamer in Father Hewit's composition. His mind was of that keen, logical, analytical bent that left nothing to the imagination, and accepted from it nothing that it could not demonstrate by logical process. His father was of the New England Puritan stock; a Presbyterian clergyman; his mother a lady of Irish birth. It might be said that by nature Father Hewit was a theologian. It was this fine natural gift of his which led him into the bosom of the Catholic Church. When called upon to make his studies for the Church of his sires his mind began to examine the basic problems of religion in a way that led to doubts of his position, and once this element arose there was no rest for mind or soul until the question had been debated down to one single issue; and the solution of that issue to

the one inevitable path, the universal road-system which radiates from Rome. His accession to the Paulist Congregation insured the success of that important experiment. He has been the theologian of the movement par excellence, the masterly expositor of Christian truth, before whose keen-bladed beautiful logic no intellectual armor was proof. Hence in his earlier days he achieved wonderful success in those early missionary tours of the Paulists with which the names of Hecker, Baker, Hewit, and Derhon are imperishably associated.

To the readers of this REVIEW it is entirely unnecessary to say anything respecting the great gifts of Father Hewit as a writer. His chaste, cogent method of argument, his fine philosophic treatment of whatsoever question he handled, have been universally admired. His choicest work has appeared, perhaps, in those matchless essays which have from time to time been contributed to these pages; and his heart was in the work. To the writer of these lines there was profound pathos in the observation made by Father Hewit to him a few months ago, "I have written my last article for the *QUARTERLY*—the last I shall ever write in this world." His failing health had not by any means dimmed the brightness of his mind or diminished the enthusiasm for the exposition of Catholic truth; but he felt the time approaching when he must give his undivided thoughts to the solemn change which he felt impending, and dwell exclusively in spirit with God.

As head of the Paulist Congregation Father Hewit was pre-eminently fit and commanding. His character was such as to inspire veneration and respect, and though he was at times regarded by the younger members with the wholesome awe of the authoritative superior, he gained their love by a sweet fatherly familiarity at periods of relaxation which flowed from that happy blending of dignity and charm which are to be found in the true type of the Christian gentleman. His life was saintly as his scholarship was splendid. And he bore the long-drawn-out physical suffering which it was his lot to endure with that true heroism which utters no sigh or word of complaint. May his sleep in God be the sweeter, and his crown the more resplendent!



## Scientific Chronicle.

---

### GLASS BRICKS AND BUILDINGS.

THAT "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones" is a well-known scrap of popular philosophy. Since, however, say and do what you may, some people will still amuse themselves and annoy their neighbors by launching lapidarious projectiles, right and left, at random, it seems to follow, unless the teachings of our old professor of logic were at fault, that they should beware of living in glass houses. Of course the adage is generally applied in a metaphorical sense, and, so applied, is supposed to cover a goodly heap of very deep wisdom.

With the metaphorical sense we do not propose to grapple just now, but to dwell rather on the question of real, material, houses of glass. We do not include in our remarks such things as "greenhouses," nor so-called "Crystal Palaces," consisting as they do mainly of brick and wood and iron, with indeed a liberal supply of ordinary glazing in the walls and roofs. On the contrary, we meant to speak of glass when used as the actual material of the building, and not as a mere supplementary ornament.

At a recent exhibition in Stuttgart, several small structures were shown, built of so-called "Glass Bricks." These bricks are not of the form of the ordinary baked clay article with which we are so familiar, mere rectangular parallelopipedons of hardened mud. We feel in our bones that such materials and such forms are beginning to look altogether too prosaic to suit the taste of the closing years of the nineteenth century.

It is somewhat difficult to give in writing a clear idea of what the form of these glass bricks really is, but the following attempt at a description may help us through. Suppose we take two capital V's, measuring each five inches across the open end, and five and one-half inches in width. Let us place them in contact, base to base. The result will be a diamond-shaped figure, five inches in width, and eleven inches in length. Now cut off the sharper angles equally so as to leave the figure only eight inches long. The resulting hexagon would about represent the form and dimensions of the face of the brick. Next make the whole thing four inches thick, and you have it complete, as far as the size and general form are concerned. The bricks are manufactured by blowing, just as bottles and many other things in this world, and are therefore hollow.

Instead of being plane, the upper and under surfaces are ribbed, or corrugated, in such a way that the ridges of one brick may fit loosely into the depressions of the next one below or above it. A thin layer of

cement will then hold them very strongly and solidly in place. The lateral surfaces are grooved so that heavy wire may be worked around the bricks alternately from right to left, and from left to right, both longitudinally and transversally.

When tied in this network of wire and properly cemented, they make an exceedingly strong arrangement, suitable for roofs and floors, which, except for very large surfaces, will require little or no supplementary support. If, however, supports are necessary, the ordinary arrangement of rafters, girders, pillars or partition-walls will answer every purpose. When used for the side-walls of buildings, the bricks may be laid flat, or be stood on end. In the former case, their longer dimensions may be made parallel with the line of the wall, or perpendicular to it. If stood on end, there is the same choice between two positions, as either the face or the side of the brick may be turned outwards. Each of these methods will give a character of its own to the wall-surface, and it is evident that with different combinations of them, the architect has in his hands the means of producing very varied and pleasing effects.

What advantages now for building purposes will glass have over brick or stone? It is evidently unnecessary to bring wood into the comparison, for no one who can afford brick or stone ever thinks of using wood in these days. Glass, it is true, is brittle, but this property manifests itself only when the material is subjected to sudden shocks or blows. Under mere static pressure it is far stronger than brick or any ordinary building stone.

As to cost, though we have not the exact figures at hand, and must draw on our guessing powers to some extent, we believe that, given a sufficient demand, and proper facilities for the manufacture thereof, glass bricks could be supplied as cheaply, or nearly as cheaply, bulk for bulk, as first-class bricks or good cut stone. But even if the cost of glass were considerably greater than that of brick or stone, the advantages to be enumerated below would undoubtedly more than offset the difference in price.

Glass is everlasting. It never decays. It never rots. Heat and cold, sunshine and storm, which play such havoc with other materials, have, on the block of glass, no destructive effect. As the ages roll on, structures of brick or stone, and even of iron or steel, crumble to clay, and sand, and rust, respectively; but a building of glass would still stand strong and fresh and bright, even long after the day when some traveller from Greater Hawaii shall have taken his stand under a broken tower of the Brooklyn Bridge to sketch the ruins of the once imperial New York.

Glass is not porous, and therefore does not absorb moisture; and being hard and smooth, it does not afford resting-places for dust, with consequent nesting-places for fungus germs. It does not tarnish permanently, and any little dust or dirt adhering to an outside wall would usually be washed away by the rain, or, failing that, by a little water from a garden hose. Inside surfaces would seldom require more than the application of a feather-duster to keep them clean and healthy.

Glass itself is a fairly good non-conductor of heat, but a hollow glass brick is a still better non-conductor than a solid lump would be. Hence a building made of such brick would be cooler in summer and warmer in winter than the buildings in which, according to the seasons, we shiver or swelter now. An even temperature is one of the things most conducive to health, and though this cannot be had in our climate, yet the changes from hot to cold, and from cold to hot would be much less rapid in a house of glass than in one of any other material, and this in itself is already a great gain, and is the next best thing to evenness of temperature.

Buildings of glass would require neither lathing nor plastering, nor whitewashing, nor any outside painting of roofs or walls. Of course doors and windows would have to undergo the usual treatment. Walls that are to be plastered must first be furred and lathed. This leaves an air-space behind, which is very good to keep out dampness and cold, but at the same time it constitutes wooden-lined flues that prove very dangerous in case of fire. The glass wall or partition secures all the advantages of the plastered wall without any of its dangers and disadvantages.

These advantages all put together might not suffice to induce the conservative house-builder to make so radical a change in his ideas. The older system is in possession, and will not easily be dispossessed. We have however another argument in reserve, and one which we believe to be the strongest of all, and capable of bearing down all opposition.

What the world needs and always hankers after is "light, more light," physical as well as intellectual and moral. We want in our houses, in our churches, and especially in our business offices and our workshops, all the light we can get, short of the direct sunlight. At the same time we do not want to be exposed to the prying gaze of the public. Now by means of the glass bricks spoken of above, light, and plenty of it, as well as perfect privacy, is secured. The surfaces of the glass bricks are so ribbed and roughened that the light is broken and scattered in all directions, and made to penetrate into every nook and corner of the apartments, while actual vision is as effectively hindered as it would be by a wall of stone. The glass might, moreover, be tinted to suit the taste or whims of the owners. An Englishman would probably prefer red: a Frenchman, blue; an Irishman, green; a Chinaman, yellow. For ourselves we would prefer the pure white light just as God made it, and which contains, at least potentially, all possible colors.

In the case of an office building, to obtain the best effects, the outer walls, the partitions, the roof, and all the floors should be made of glass. This would secure an abundance of light in every story, and in every room from garret to cellar. Of course some of the roof light would be obstructed by articles of furniture on the different floors, but there would still remain quite a large percentage of free floor-space that would allow light to pass to the different stories below. The furniture in the rooms would moreover naturally be arranged so as to obstruct as little as possible the light from the walls.

In dwellings, and especially in tenement-houses, it would, for obvious reasons, be better to have all the floors, and the partitions between the tenements, opaque. Under those circumstances ordinary partitions and floors would probably be preferable, in some respects, to glass. Glass, to be opaque, would have to be jet black, and a black partition would present a rather funereal aspect. The partitions of a single suite of rooms might well be glass, and curtains could be arranged that would cover the entire partitions when the occupants so desired. In like manner provision should be made for shutting out the light from the external walls. Besides, glass is a good conductor of sound, and this would be an additional reason why it ought not to be used for partitions between different tenements, since people generally prefer not to hear, or at least not to be heard, from one tenement to another. Again, a glass floor in a family, where young children are tumbling around and bumping their skulls, would hardly be deemed a source of peace and comfort in the house. The floor could stand it, but other far-reaching complications might arise, necessitating the re-writing of the whole science of Phrenology, and the devising of some means of distinguishing between essential bumps of character and bumps accidental. For the outer walls, however, we still vote for glass, and for glass only.

Suppose, now, all the streets of a city were lined with houses built in the way proposed. During the day there would be plenty of light everywhere, and it would last to a somewhat later hour than it does with us now. During the evening, however late that might be protracted, the lights of the streets would give a helping hand to the indoor lights, and the indoor lights would repay in kind, and so add considerably to the illumination, and consequently to the beauty as well as to the safety of the streets.

Yet, as we have already hinted, there are times when we wish to be left in darkness and alone. When, therefore,

"The waning hour to bedward bids,  
And gentle sleep sits waiting on our lids,"

all we have to do is to draw the curtains, and retire in peace, to dream of another City where there is no night, but always light, and where the very streets themselves are of pure gold *as transparent as glass*.

Another purpose for which it is proposed to employ glass is for the construction of monuments, especially such as are used in cemeteries. For this the glass should be plate-glass, polished and transparent, colored or colorless according to the taste of the owner. Tombstones and monuments of this kind would be indestructible, and the inscriptions thereon, barring external accidents, ought to last easily to the end of the world.

#### WOOD-PULP.

According to one Mr. Hesiod, some time deceased, the course of time on this little planet should be divided into five periods, or what he calls ages. The first of these, under the tutelage of Saturn, was named the patriarchal, or Golden Age; the second, ruled by Jupiter, son of Saturn,

was the luxurious age, or Age of Silver; the third, presided over by Neptune, another son of Saturn, the warlike, or Brazen Age; the fourth, the Heroic Age, was managed by Mars, son of Jupiter and grandson of Saturn; the fifth, the Age of Iron, was under the especial care of Pluto, Saturn's third son. Now, although we look upon the stories of the gods of the Gentiles as mere fables, myths and allegories, they, nevertheless, when rightly interpreted, represent the origin of man and his journey through time in a far truer light than the fables of our modern self-styled scientists who would trace back our ancestry to frogs, fishes, lizards and baboons.

But the men of our times, passing over the allegorical meaning, and taking, for the moment, the whole thing in a literal sense, often call the present century the Age of Steel; and it seems really to have deserved the name. The new uses to which steel has been applied during this century are almost beyond our powers of computation. We are therefore willing to concede the title, but when we went about preparing to carve an inscription for the tombstone of the dying Nineteenth Century, before laying him decently away to rest, the inscription took, ever and anon, in spite of us, the following form:

Here Lies  
THE AGE OF STEEL,  
Born the First Instant  
of  
January 1st, 1801;  
Died the Last Instant  
of  
December 31st, 1900;  
Aged 100 years.  
This Monument was Erected  
by His Son,  
Who Hereby Assumes the Name and Title  
of  
The Age of Wood.

Is, therefore, the coming century to be the Age of Wood? At first our pride rebelled against the thought, but on mature examination, we not only became convinced ourselves, but we think we can convince our readers that such will indeed be the case. Let us to our task.

Wood in its crude state, as hewn from the forests, or in its more elaborate condition as worked up into infinitely varied forms by the tools of the artisan and of the artist, had already been in use for ages before the "Father of History" was rocked to chronological dreams in his wooden cradle. From the first wooden fork and spoon, to the wooden

ships that have ploughed every sea and breasted the billows of every ocean is a long, long stretch, and one would think that in so long a time no possible use for the material could have been forgotten. But it is not of the uses of wood in its natural state that we are to speak at present; that part of the subject has been pretty well threshed out by others already.

Our object is to record something not absolutely new, it is true, but still newer than carpentry, and far less known. We are going to speak of the means that have been devised during these latter years of treating wood so as practically to change its nature, and make of it, as it were, a new substance, and thus render it suitable for a number of purposes, for which, before such treatment, it was totally unfit. The general treatment is quite simple and easily understood, but the details are very numerous, and vary greatly according to the uses for which the material is ultimately intended. Sometimes, moreover, these details are carefully guarded as trade secrets.

The general treatment to which we refer consists in reducing the wood to the condition of a smooth pulp. There are two methods of doing this, the mechanical and the chemical. The mechanical process consists in grinding the wood to a fine powder in the presence of plenty of water. In the chemical process the wood is disintegrated and reduced to pure fibre by boiling it in caustic soda. The material obtained by this second process differs somewhat from that obtained by grinding, and is technically termed "wood-fibre," but the general name "wood-pulp" is a sufficient designation for both kinds. This wood-pulp is the basis, or raw material, for a considerable number of more or less important industries, and their number is continually increasing. The subsequent treatment of the pulp in detail depends on the object which the manufacturer has in view.

In the January number of this REVIEW we mentioned the employment of wood-pulp for the manufacture of artificial silk, and it seems that the industry is in quite a flourishing condition, especially in France. We hope to see it better known and more extended in the near future.

Another use for wood-pulp, and one which has only quite lately been brought to light, is for the production of lining for carpets. It is a popular fallacy, shared in by many who in other things have plenty of knowledge to spare, and who keep it always on tap, that all, or nearly all, inventions and discoveries have been the result of lucky accidents. The fact is that most of them have been about as accidental as the solution of a problem in geometry. The inventions of Mr. Edison, for example, for which he has taken out 711 patents in the last 25 years—thus averaging more than one every two weeks—were all arrived at by hard thinking and persevering experimentation on definite, self-imposed problems. But let that pass; for we know, at any rate, that this new application of wood-pulp has by no means been the outcome of chance.

Everybody knows that the hard canvas lining of carpets will cause them to wear out rapidly when they are laid directly on the bare floor. Hence the practice of underlaying them with some yielding material,

such as cotton batting, or the like. Even this does not preserve its elasticity very long, but soon gets hard, especially in those spots where it is most trampled on. Moreover, even this half-measure cannot be resorted to when carpets are used as they regularly ought to be—that is, in isolated strips, here and there, where really needed, and where alone they do any positive good, without at the same time doing positive harm. Knowing these things, some one, whose name unhappily we have not learned, conceived the bright idea of making an elastic backing a part of the carpet itself.

Knowing also that the properties of wood-pulp can be very closely regulated by proper admixtures and manipulations, he set to work to experiment. He reasoned that, to be elastic, the carpet lining must be made porous. This end he accomplished by incorporating with the pulp, at the proper stage of its manufacture, some albuminous substance, which could be made to ferment and give off carbonic acid, and so produce the same effect that is produced in the raising of dough. He knew also that the lining must be insoluble, firm and durable, and, withal, pliable. These properties are secured by the admixture of well-known hardening chemicals, such as bichromate of potash, alum, etc., in exactly the correct proportions. He reasoned again that it would be desirable to have his carpet lining proof against moths and other insects, and therefore incorporated into the pulp such substances as asafoetida, camphor and chicle. He has even gone so far as to perfume the pulp with monobromated camphor and menthol. Concerning this last point, though we agree with the poet (revised edition) that

“A little perfume now and then  
Is relished by the most of men,”

yet for everyday wear the best of all perfumes is no perfume at all.

Well, having added to the pulp all the necessary ingredients that experiment and experience have shown to be good and desirable, and all in the very best proportions, the manufacturer works the whole mass, through a system of cylinders and pipes, over and over again, until it is perfectly homogeneous and exactly of the right consistence. When applied to the carpet the liquid portion of the mixture evaporates and leaves behind a firm and firmly-adhering, pliable, durable, noise-destroying, elastic backing. It will be a pleasure ever after for grown people to walk on it, and generations yet unborn will in after life look back and bless the happy days they spent in the nursery whose hemlock or glass floor was covered with such an ideal carpeting.

The two uses just enumerated for wood-pulp are good enough in their somewhat limited ways, but are much less important than its use for the manufacture of paper. All of us who are on this side of fifty remember the time when paper for writing and printing was made exclusively from cotton or linen rags. A cheap kind of wrapping-paper was, indeed, made from straw, but it was a marvel of uselessness.

Nowadays, in this country at least, by far the greater part of all our paper is made from wood-pulp. The poorer grades, such as are used for

newspapers, is from the pulp made by the grinding process; the better grades, those used for writing and for good book-work, from the chemically prepared stuff. It is not our purpose to describe the details of paper-making. Suffice it to say, in this place, that the introduction of wood-pulp as a basis for paper and the recent improvements in machinery have resulted in a great increase of speed in the manufacture, a great amelioration in the quality, and a reduction of at least fifty per cent. in the price. Whereas, in the earlier machines, a speed producing forty linear feet of paper per minute was the maximum, the perfected American machines of to-day frequently reach two hundred and fifty feet per minute, and even more.

We have not at hand the latest reports of the paper trade, but it is certainly within the mark to say that the number of pulp-mills and paper-mills in the United States at the present time is fully 1,200, employing about 50,000 hands, and turning out yearly about 1,500,000 tons of paper, valued at over \$100,000,000. It may also be worth while to put on record, in this connection, that a firm in the State of Maine, called the Rumford Falls Paper Company, is just adding to its plant a new machine which is the largest in the world. It weighs 1,200,000 pounds, or 600 tons, and is capable of producing a roll of paper 12½ feet wide and of any length at the astonishing rate of 500 linear feet per minute, or in a complete day of 24 hours it will turn out 9,000,000 square feet. The paper manufactured by this machine, in a year of 300 working days, would, therefore, cover a surface of nearly 62,000 acres.

In the days of Pliny, paper made from the pith of the papyrus plant had a maximum width of 9½ inches, and yet he says: "On the use of paper depends in a very great degree human culture and the memory of the past." And again: "On paper depends man's immortality." What a vast amount of culture there must be among us now!

Finally, an indirect way of making use of wood-pulp is by first putting it into the form of paper, then reducing that back to the state of a stiff pulp again, mixing it with some adhesive material, moulding it under strong pressure into various forms, and then coating it with some protective varnish, such as asphalt, or ornamenting it with various pigments. The material thus produced is termed *papier-maché*. It is extensively used in the manufacture of boxes, snuff-boxes included, trays, toys, interior decorations of houses, in imitation of stucco-work, for cornices, ceilings, and even walls. Likewise for making water-buckets, bottles, barrels, boats, car-wheels, etc., almost to no end. All the things we have enumerated from the beginning, and hundreds of others besides, come ultimately from the trees of our forests, and we therefore do not think it too much to claim that the twentieth century ought to be called the Age of Wood. What else the next century may have in store for our successors on this ever-shifting stage, finite intelligence will seek in vain to foretell.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S.J.

## Book Notices.

---

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGICÆ IN USUM SCHOLARUM. Auctore *G. Bernardo Tepe, S.J.*  
4 vol. Parisiis: Lethielleux, 10 Rue Cassette, 1896. Pr. 24 francs. Index,  
 $\frac{1}{2}$  franc.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGICÆ DOGMATICÆ. Auctore *R. P. J. Herrmann, C.S.S.R.* 3  
vol. Romæ: Phil. Cuggiani, Via della Pace, 35. 1897.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGICÆ DOGMATICÆ. Auctore *Petro Einig, D.D.* Tract. de  
Deo Uno et Trino. Treviris, Ex-officina ad S. Paulinum. 1897. Pr. 2.80 marks.

The closing decades of our century bid fair to rival in fertility of theological literature the prolific years of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The yield of works on dogmatic science has in recent times been truly wonderful, and though the product may not be compared for breadth and depth with the giant tomes of the classical age of theology, still the present literature of the subject reflects a marked rigidity of method and a special adaptation in selection of details to contemporary phases of science and philosophy. Some even professional students of theology question the utility of the increasing multiplication of texts of theology. Works of this kind cover practically the same subject-matter, and exhibit little variation in method of exposition, so that if one were to take a mere utilitarian view of the subject there would indeed appear no tangible plea to favor the increasing supply that would seem to be running beyond an answering demand. On the other hand, it should be remembered that theology more than any other science is a living habit. Vitalized in the mind of its possessor, it must ever keep adjusting itself to its environment, assimilating herefrom new points of view from which to regard its aggregate of truths, seeking for fresh analogies to illustrate those truths and to bring them home to the consciousness of the student. The sum total of growth which any one theologian may add to his science may not lend itself to exact measurement, but the multiplying products from so many sources are a sign of vigorous life and analogous to the contemporary development of the literature of physical science make steadily for the broadening and deepening of theological truth directly amongst professional students, seminarians, and the clergy—and indirectly amongst the laity.

Some such general remarks have seemed almost necessary to the present writer as a sort of apology for introducing several recent text-books on dogmatics in the wake of the oft-repeated appearances of similar works in these pages.

To the first work on our list a passing reference was made in the January issue of this REVIEW. In the meantime Father Tepe's "Institutiones" has been commented on by the higher Catholic periodicals in Europe and in this country, and from every quarter has received high encomia. One need read but little in any of its four volumes to find a justification of this universal approbation. Embodying as the work does the substance of instruction in dogmatic theology, given by the author during the last quarter of a century, to the scholastics of the English province of the Society of Jesus, one naturally expects to find in it those perfections which adapt it thoroughly to its purpose as a guide to the candidate for the priesthood. One estimates a work of its character by its possession

of these well-marked qualities. Firstly, it should present its subject-matter with such fulness as to afford the student a complete survey of dogmatic truths, with the apposite arguments clearly and solidly expounded whereon such truths are based. Secondly, it should enable the student to become sufficiently familiar with the questions freely agitated in theological schools, so that he may unerringly discern the limits of faith and certainty on the one side and the outlying domain of opinion and varying degrees of probability on the other. Thirdly, it should marshal fully and cogently and refute convincingly the leading objections made against the dogmata of the Church, especially in our day.

Judged by these criteria, Father Tepe's work deserves strong commendation. In the four compact volumes, averaging more than seven hundred pages each, sufficient space has been allowed for a comprehensive exposition of dogmatic teaching. In the unfolding of this content the usual method of the schools has, of course, been rigidly followed—the theses, state of the question, the arguments from the various sources forming the closely-linked chain with which every student of theology is familiar. In the development of the arguments the author's theological habit is seen to advantage. The scriptural texts are not simply cited and allowed to impress their implications in the student's mind. The author is careful to bring out by an acute and sustained dialectic the real inwardness of the inspired passage and its bearing on the pertinent theses.

The second and, we may conjoin, the third excellence of the work are apparent in the careful segregation of the positive teaching of the Church from the counter-attacks of heresy and infidelity on the one hand and the controversies of the schools on the other. The numerous scholia appended to the central theses offer the appropriate places for these conflicts and side-issues. Thus the student is not carried away from what is essential to the theological habit to what is at most but of secondary importance.

The second work on our list covers the same ground as the preceding, though in a somewhat more synoptical fashion. The compression in bulk has, however, sacrificed nothing essential to comprehensive treatment. The curtailing is done chiefly in the Patristic and Conciliar citations. The specially noteworthy feature of P. Herrmann's "*Institutiones*" lies in the use he has made of St. Alphonsus. St. Thomas has, of course, been in the main the author's guide and source of material, but he appeals largely to St. Ligouri as an exponent of the Angelic Doctor. Students who are familiar with the writings of St. Alphonsus in moral theology alone are not aware of the rich dogmatic material contained in his many works. It is, however, to this characteristic of his works that Pius IX. appeals in his brief conceding the title of doctor to the saint: *Hoc prædicare veriùssime potest, nullum esse vev temporum nostrorum errorem qui maxima saltem ex-parte non sit ab Alphonso refutatus.*

It might be interesting to compare the unity in variety exhibited by the two works under notice, in a question such as the Mosaic cosmogony. In both one sees the large liberty enjoyed by theologians on this subject. Father Tepe, for instance, gives his authority to the opinion which regards the Genesiactal days as ideal rather than as physical—as indicating, that is, degrees in the cosmical process at which there occurred special intervention of Divine Providence in bringing about a higher stage of development. Father Herrmann makes no express mention of this view, but whilst showing some preference for the period theory emphasizes the fact that the literal interpretation has not been as yet apodictically refuted. Neither author makes any concessions to transform-

ism. Father Tepe regards the proposition that denies the evolution of Adam's body from a brute organism as *de fide*. P. Herrmann says: *alii eam dicunt de fide, alii tantum certam vel fidei proximam*.

A few words in conclusion on the third work on our list. We have in a previous number of this REVIEW spoken of the first of Prof. Einig's Theological Tractates—that, viz., dealing with Grace. It is the author's design to publish singly the integral tracts of his course of theology delivered by him during the past ten years in the diocesan seminary of Treves. The present treatise on the Unity and Trinity of God is the second to appear in the order of publication. Like the preceding, it reflects the qualities that make the serviceable text-book—comprehensiveness of material, lucidity of definition, solidity and yet brevity of exposition. The author has not only drawn extensively from St. Thomas, but has assimilated much of the speculative spirit of the Angelic Doctor. He accordingly makes considerable use of the *rationes theologice* taken from the Summa, frequently assigning to them the first place in the order of his arguments.

We notice that in the first part of his tract Dr. Einig has had his eyes on the Ritschlian theology. In this respect the work should have a special interest for students of theology in Germany. F. P. S.

PRIMER OF PHILOSOPHY. By Dr. Paul Carus. Revised edition. Chicago: Open Court Pub. Co. Pp. vi., 232.

It is difficult to judge this book impartially. The author shows such an oracular spirit, such a gentlemen-you-are-all-wrong-and-I-am-going-to-set-you-right sort of an attitude, that one has to brace himself up and steady his arm with determination before he places the book in the scale of justice, lest he unconsciously tilt the balance too much on the adverse side. Having gotten ourselves in as equal-minded a state as possible, let us weigh the work as fairly as we can. And first it deserves an allowance of praise. *Apriori*, its origin ought to favor it. Dr. Carus is well known in the United States, particularly in Chicago, as editor of the "Monist," a quarterly review devoted to philosophy, religion, science and sociology, and also as editor of the "Open Court," a weekly publication, the leading feature of whose program is this: "The 'Open Court' does not understand by religion any creed or dogmatic belief, but man's world-conception in so far as it regulates his conduct. The old dogmatic conception of religion is based upon the science of past ages (sic?); to base religion upon the matured and truest thought of the present time is the object of the 'Open Court.'" Now, any one who has followed these publications during the past six years is aware how indefatigably their editor has labored to fulfil their program. Besides his uncounted contributions to these periodicals, Dr. Carus has written many books on cognate lines. All this experience of things philosophical should certainly qualify him to produce a primer of philosophy—a task, let it however be noted, by the way, more difficult of proper accomplishment than the writing of a small library—especially when the term is taken in the sense defined by our author—not, that is, as a book of instruction for "beginners in philosophy" (though he regards it as "eminently available for that purpose"), but "a presentation of the subject in the plainest and most lucid form . . . with great simplicity, so that its leading idea can be gathered by a mere glance at its contents."

As an adjunct to his experience in kindred lines of thought, Dr. Carus brings to his present task a most earnest zeal for the advancement of philosophy. He bewails the present decadence of philosophy, which, he

says, "is like a ship run aground. Her helmsmen themselves have declared that further headway is impossible; that philosophical problems in their very nature are insolvable, and that there can be, therefore, but one true philosophy—the philosophy of agnosticism, which indolently acquiesces in the profession of a modest *ignorabimus*. It is but natural that under such circumstances the proud craft was abandoned by the most gallant of her crew" (iv.). "Philosophy in former ages boldly led the van of human progress, but it has now ceased to be considered of any practical importance. The public smile sarcastically at the perplexities of its hopeless condition, and the scientist has got into the habit of ignoring it entirely. And why should he not? Philosophy has become more of a hindrance than a help to him, blockading his way and spreading a mist before his eyes. Thus, to the detriment of true science, the sciences have gradually degenerated into mere specialties; with their philosophical background the various branches of scientific inquiry have lost all intercoherence and deeper significances" (*ib.*).

This is all truly and strongly said, and none will refuse to mingle their tears with those of Dr. Carus over the decline and fall of philosophy. But we are aroused to a new hope and fervor by the manly tone of our leader: "All this must change," he cries. "A new vista is opened before our eyes in which philosophy will become what it ought to be. Philosophy is no longer doomed to lie in the stagnant swamps where progress has become impossible, but strikes out boldly for new fields of noble work and practical usefulness" (*ib.*). If to the subjective merits—experience and zeal in the author—we seek to add another title in which to commend the book itself, we may find such in the fragments of tangible thought scattered here and there over the pages. Reading the book, it is true, is rather tedious, unhopeful placer-mining. Still one picks up here and there a nugget worth the keeping. The style is sententious, and the epigrams that abound are often suggestive.

To this triplet of commendatory titles we can add but one more to round off an harmonious quartette, viz.: the natural make-up of the book. The arrangement of the subjects is orderly, the paper good, the letter-press clear and attractive. With this we have exhausted the category of praise, and would fain stop right here. Our readers, however, may be desirous of having some specimens of the author's philosophy. There is such vagueness of thought pervading the chapters whose titles would lead one to expect clean-cut philosophical analysis that we must confine ourselves to the author's definitions, for they, above all logical processes, are indexes of a mind's grasp of objects. *Imagination* the author defines as "The free play of ideas of that quality of thinking beings which allows images or ideas to enter into all possible combinations" (p. 193). "*Intellect* is the presence of such conditions as make cognition possible" (p. 194). "*Reason* is (1) that quality of sentient beings which make thought operations possible. . . (2) The method of thinking, the purpose of which is the economy of thought" (*ib.*).

"*Thought* or thinking is the interaction that takes place among sentient symbols" (192). "*Soul* is the name given to the system of sentient symbols as a totality" (*ib.*). "By *person* we understand the totality of the memory-structures and composite images interrelated among each other in an individual organism" (p. 191).

From these definitions the reader will easily infer the author's point of view, which, as he says, "is new to the extent that it cannot be classified among any of the various schools of recent thought. It represents rather a reconciliation of rival philosophies of the type of Kantian apriorism and John Stuart Mill's empiricism. The reconciliation reached disposes for good of a number of fundamental problems," etc. (p. 3.)

Dr. Carus devotes the latter portion of his book to religion. His definition of religion is marked by the individuality which characterizes his philosophical conceptions. "Religion," he says, "is not identical with science; religion is the enthusiasm of applying that knowledge, of whose truth and potency we are unwaveringly convinced, to practical life. . . . Science is of the head, religion of the heart" (p. 207).

Christianity, we are informed, is of two kinds: "The one is the spirit of the lesson taught mankind in the life and death of Christ, the other is a church organization which historically originated with Jesus and claims that the acceptance of certain dogmas is the indispensable condition of salvation. The former is the very soul of civilization, the latter an embarrassing dead weight on the feet of mankind, obstructing all progress and higher development" (p. 196). Our Lord "has nowhere, so far as our maturest biblical criticism can pierce, established any dogma" (p. 206). "To look upon prayer in any other light than as a self-discipline is to share the superstition of the medicine-man who still believes in the spells by which he thinks to change the course of nature" (p. 202).

Does the "Religion of Science" commit its followers to such *dogmata*?  
F. P. S.

LA FRANCE ET LE GRAND SCHISME D'OCCIDENT. Par *Noël Valois*. Vol. I.-II. Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils, 82 Rue Bonaparte. 1896.

A new treatise on the thorny subject of the Great Schism of the West from the pen of the conscientious and erudite M. Valois is a veritable literary treasure; and the present reviewer has perused his latest and most valuable contribution towards the clearing up of one of the most troublesome of historical questions all the more eagerly because when we ourselves ventured, some years ago, to tell the story of the origin of the Schism, or rather to point out that the story as commonly told ought to be received with considerable caution, we found ourselves opposed by the authority of the great name of Valois. And now, after so many years of additional study and research, the illustrious French writer states his verdict upon the evidence in terms almost identical with those employed by us. On page 82 of his first volume, after a remarkably able sifting of the testimonies of Urbanists and Clementines, he sums up: "Il en résulte que la question est loin d'être aussi simple que le prétendent, d'une part, les défenseurs des papes de Rome, d'autre part, les partisans des papes d'Avignon." He pronounces the legitimacy of the opposing claimants a "question encore douteuse," concerning which "l'Eglise s'est toujours abstenue de trancher la question." He maintains with us that "la neutralité que l'Eglise gardait dans ce débat laissait libre carrière aux erudits" (p. 4).

Our own deliberate opinion on the juridical aspect of the question has always been that the violence of the populace was sufficient to affect the validity of the election of Urban, but that the subsequent action of the cardinals in adhering for months to one whom, without any co-operation on his part, they had chosen as the only available candidate, abundantly healed all the illegalities of the proceedings. But we give this opinion for what it is worth, and are far from wishing to dogmatize or to restrict the liberty of others.

The violent scenes enacted at Rome during the conclave of 1378 were by no means a novelty in the turbulent capital of the Christian world. Other conclaves had been accompanied with similar or greater disturbances. That which gave to this conclave its fatal importance was the firm determination of Christendom, and particularly of the

French nation, to finish, once for all, the unruly interference of the Roman mob in the election of the Supreme Pontiffs. The sojourn of the Popes in Avignon, far from lowering the prestige of the Papacy, had vastly increased its dignity in the eyes of the European nations, as it had permitted them to study it at closer range and to gain a more vivid realization of its immense influence for good upon the public life of the world. No one was more keenly sensible of the importance of the Papacy than the sage and religious monarch, Charles V. of France, who from the beginning was looked upon as the mainstay of the seceding cardinals. Rinaldi and other historians who based their judgment on the vehement diatribes of Urban have not hesitated to accuse Charles of having, for selfish political purposes, fomented the whole disturbance. M. Valois, following the course of events step by step with microscopic diligence, seems to have established beyond doubt the following facts: That Charles was nowise responsible for the initial steps of the cardinals, who proceeded on their reckless course of appealing to Christendom and electing Clement VII. without his knowledge, much less instigation; that he was, at an early date, prejudiced by the cardinals, who were more active than Urban in setting their version of the story before the French monarch and enlisting his sympathies; that Charles was personally convinced of the justness of the claims made by the Sacred College, and esteemed it his duty as a Catholic monarch to lend them the full support of his realm. His protestation that, had the Cardinals legally elected even an Englishman, one of his inveterate foes, he would be the foremost in yielding him homage and obedience, manifests the attitude of his mind, and proves that he was only unconsciously biased by national sympathies and antipathies. However disastrous, therefore, the decision and consequent conduct of Charles may have been, we are compelled to give him credit for good faith and purity of intention.

The remaining part of Valois' first volume, and the whole of the second, are devoted to an equally careful and impartial study of the progress of the Schism within and outside the realm of France, with special reference to the countries which were most subject to French influence. Without any further words of commendation from us, the work will be cordially welcomed by all those who are interested in original historical research.

---

"LES SAINTS : " PSYCHOLOGIE DES SAINTS. Par *Henri Joly*. Paris: Victor Lecoffre. 1897. Pp. ix, 201. Price, 2 francs.

Most readers familiar with hagiography have felt the injustice of Mgr. Dupanloup's criticism—"Il y a bien peu de vies de saints écrites comme elles devraient l'être." How such lives should be written no one has better described than the same eminent critic. The biographer must love his subject—must devote to it a thorough study in its sources and contemporary documents—must picture the soul of the saint in its struggles, in the interrelations of nature and grace—must tell the story with simplicity, truth, dignity, with insight into such detail of life as shall make the saint and his times stand out in relief, yet not so as to hide the personage behind the collateral facts of history and to take second rank in the narrative—must present authentic facts, yet artistically grouped and disposed in that judicious order which illumines the whole drama of the saint's life; the style must be simple, grave, and yet penetrating and moving. These are the qualifications Mgr. Dupanloup demands of the hagiographer. They are found verified in such biographies as Montalambert's *St. Elizabeth*, Fouard's *St. Peter and St. Paul*,

Le Monier's St. Francis of Assissi, Bougaud's St. Monica and St. Jane Francis, Miss Drane's St. Dominic and St. Catharine of Sienna, to mention but a few of the better known works of the class. Biographies, however, such as these are all too extensive to meet the wants and tastes of the majority of readers. In view of this fact, an undertaking has been inaugurated in France to issue a series of lives of the more prominent saints written on the lines drawn by Mgr. Dupanloup. The author of the work here at hand is editor-in-chief of the series, and has secured as collaborators many of the most eminent writers amongst the clergy and the laity of France.

His "Psychology of the Saints" furnishes a solid introduction to the series, of which, by the way, four volumes have thus far been issued—Sts. Augustine, Clotilde, St. Augustine of Canterbury, and the Bl. Bernardine de Feltre.

M. Joly opens his work with an inductive study of the conception of sanctity in the light of its history, especially in the Old and the New Testaments and in the bosom of the Church. He compares the conception with that of the hero and the mystic—the outcome of his analysis being the true definition of the saint: "Un homme qui sert Dieu héroïquement et par amour."

The psychological work proper begins with the second chapter, by a search into the natural endowments of the saint, showing how they subsist and develop under the action of supernatural grace. The author examines the various theories that have been advanced by modern unbelievers to account for the extraordinary phenomena in the lives of the saints—their revelations, visions, prophecies, ecstasies. These phenomena he proves to be explicable by no abnormal state of the nervous system. They differ essentially from their natural analogues, clairvoyance, telepathy, hysteria, etc. Lastly, he subjects to a detailed review the various psychic faculties of the saint under the influence of grace—the senses, imagination, intellect, the feelings, and especially the will dominated by love.

In following this surface current of the author's thought the reader may be tempted to regard the work as touching close upon the irreverent. Psychological analysis of an heroic soul quivering under the life of divine grace does indeed appear a hazardous work, whose promise would seem to be merited failure at best. It looks like bringing to the scales of earth the things of heaven. This, however, is not the impression the intelligent student will take from the book itself. The author is conscious of the delicacy of his task. Whilst analyzing the human faculties of the elect of God he is alive to the transcendent influence of the Holy Spirit breathing into and through the subject under dissection. Indeed the whole scope of his work is to establish this presence of the supernatural, and viewed from this standpoint it serves to strengthen the apologetic argument for the divine origin and maintenance of the spouse who alone is the fruitful mother of the heroes of sanctity.

---

LEO XIII. AND MODERN CIVILIZATION. By *J. Bleeker Miller*, of the New York Bar. New York: Eskdale Press.

*J. Bleeker Miller*, Esq., a hardy, if not illustrious, member of the New York bar, has undertaken, in the absence of more remunerative labors, the task of demolishing Pope Leo and the Roman Catholic Church, all in a duodecimo volume of 185 pages. He has no apprehension as to his qualifications for the feat; for by the extreme courtesy of His Grace Archbishop Corrigan, of New York, who (to borrow one

of his classical terms) "loaned" him a copy of the "Metaphysics of the School" by "the Jesuit Father Harper," and likewise a "publication containing the official text of the writings of Leo XIII.," our valiant champion was fully armed. It was just as well that he did not waste his time over a multitude of controversial folios. This would have distracted his attention from the main issue. By a close study of the Pope's Encyclicals, illumined by the able work of Harper, the New York barrister was enabled to discover Rome's radical error. All glory to the New York bar! One of its lights has floored Romanism with a single word, *Peripateticism*! Why were Protestants so slow in discovering the true source of Roman corruption? It was clear to demonstration. Pope Leo has been corrupted by "the Aquinate," who, in turn, was perverted by "the heathen Aristotle." Read Harper and the Pope's Encyclicals, and you will understand it all. For this brilliant discovery the name of J. Bleeker Miller, Esq., New York bar, will go rumbling down the pages of history as that of the social Columbus of modern times.

Possibly some of our readers have not fully appreciated the magnitude of Mr. Miller's discovery. In a nutshell it is this: Aristotle taught "that all motion must come from above." The *primum mobile* sets the whole universe a-going. This is truly alarming, even in the physical world. But when transferred to science and human society it becomes positively atrocious, "for it is by analogy to this alleged universal principle that the dependence of the individual, family, guild, and state (in short, of all laymen) upon the priesthood, and of the latter upon the papacy, is proved." And, since our barrister is eminently of a practical turn of mind, he wants to know "will Roman Catholic schools make good citizens?"

The quarrel, then, as Mr. Miller apprehends it, is not so much between Pope Leo and modern civilization as between the latter and Aristotle, against whom our amusing barrister harbors a resentment bordering on insanity. It is a pity that the Sage of Stagira or his admirer, "the Aquinate," could not give our author a lesson or two in a more elementary science than "misty metaphysics," namely, logic.

We should not have deemed this book worthy of a serious notice were it not accompanied with commendatory words from so eminent personages as the Episcopal bishops of New York and Albany. In the estimation of Bishop Potter, "it is a very timely and suggestive book, not merely because it traces the principles of a great ecclesiastical policy to its pagan source, but because it reveals the hostility of that policy to American ideals, whether of the state, the family, or the freedom of the individual. It is a book for statesmen, for workingmen, for parents, for all loyal citizens to read and ponder," etc., etc. Bishop Doane commends its "startling and important facts to the attentive study of our citizens." When two responsible churchmen can lend the authority of their approval to a rhapsody like this, why need we wonder at the extravagances of the common herd? And what becomes of the jejune prattle about "Reunion of Christians?"

---

ANSWER TO DIFFICULTIES OF THE BIBLE. By *Rev. John Thein*, Priest of the Cleveland Diocese, Author of "Christian Anthropology." St. Louis: B. Herder.

The appearance some years since of the work entitled "Christian Anthropology," from the pen of Father Thein, prepared all who may have read it to welcome any contribution of his to the never-ceasing discussion of burning questions in the realm of theology and philoso-

phy. The volume whose title is given above will justify the expectations entertained. As the title indicates, the work is a defence of the Holy Scriptures against the attacks of Rationalism. To the openly-declared purpose of the latter to discredit every vestige of the supernatural, Father Thein throws down the gauntlet, while he stoutly beats back, with weapons forged by geology, biology, palæontology, ethnology and profane history the attacks made by infidel philosophy upon the Bible verities.

As a work to be read by those who take it up in the spirit of that obedience of faith commended by the Apostle, it will prove a valuable and satisfactory commentary upon obscure and disputed portions of the Holy Text. What the author states in the initial chapter is undoubtedly true: "The most efficacious means to dispel the clouds which gather around our Sacred Books is not to carry therein the flame of discussion. . . . Men cannot resist the divine charm of the words of Jesus Christ when they are upright enough to impose silence upon their prejudices."

The truth of this statement, however, suggests what we think is perhaps disappointing in the work itself—probably because the task of discussing the difficulties of the Bible is too gigantic an achievement for a volume of the modest character of the one before us. The treatment of the questions at issue between the believer and the rationalist will in few cases avail to convince, or even to silence, the latter. In illustration, one might turn to the chapter on the Book of Jonas. The history of the prophet is a frequent target for the attack of those who would discredit the Bible. Father Thein first quotes instances of modern date to show the possibility, from a natural standpoint, of a great fish having swallowed the prophet alive, while he closes the chapter with a statement, covered by only two or three lines, that the presence for three days of Jonas within the fish can be accounted for only by recurrence to a miracle. To the critical reader, there is a puzzling confounding of the natural and the supernatural. The obvious explanation of this defect is the necessity the author writes under of consulting for a literal interpretation; but this merely confirms our judgment that a book of this kind, while eminently useful for the well-disposed reader of the Bible, whose *pia credulitas* will avail more for attainment of truth than pages of polemics and exegesis, will hardly take a prominent place in the mass of controversial works, the product of the relentless warfare between faith and unbelief.

Here and there are evidences of unfamiliarity with English idioms, but these to no great extent retard flow of style, much less mar its clearness.

To the student of Holy Scripture whose primary object in exegetical work is to discern the baseless character of the assaults made against the Word of God, and whose aim is to dispel any obscurity that may rest upon the truths he holds *aliunde*, Father Thein's work will prove a treasury of valuable facts and extensive erudition not heretofore open to the English reader. As such we cordially welcome it and bespeak its use, especially in the reading circles which follow biblical study as a line of work.

---

PURCELL'S "MANNING" REFUTED. Life of Cardinal Manning, with a critical examination of E. S. Purcell's Mistakes. By *Francis de Pressensé*, a French Protestant. Translated by Francis T. Furey, A.M. 12mo., pp. 214. Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey. 1897.

When Cardinal Manning died, on January 14, 1892, the world wept because one of the greatest men of the nineteenth century had passed

away. Intellectually and morally he was a giant. As priest, as cardinal, as philanthropist, as Christian socialist, his individuality has stamped itself upon the century, and he has taken his place forever in the gallery of its great men.

This was the opinion of the world that wept at his bier. The world of London, which assembled in the Brompton Oratory, and which crowded the streets through which his body was borne to its last resting-place, included all classes. The rich, the educated, the refined, the powerful; the poor, the ignorant, the crude, the weak—all bent their heads in sorrow and gave voice to the verdict of the larger world, "he was truly a great priest." The world is jealous of its heroes. It erects monuments to them of bronze and marble, and enshrines their images in the hearts of the people. He is indeed a daring man who attempts to cast down these monuments and to despoil these shrines. Woe to him if he act from malice or ignorance, for in him one is scarcely more pardonable than the other.

Hardly had the emaciated form of the Cardinal been laid to rest when Mr. E. S. Purcell mounted his tomb and said: He was not a giant, he was a pigmy. See, here is his true portrait. He was proud, unyielding, ambitious; a schemer, a politician; one who loved power, distinction, honor, and would sacrifice others to gain them. These, said this trumpeter, are the proofs. And then he placed before the world a mass of so-called evidence, made up of letters, public and private, leaves from diaries, contemporaneous documents, histories of kindred events drawn from various sources, all so clumsily put together as to create the impression that they had been carried to the printing-office in a basket and put into type at random. Behold, said Mr. Purcell, as he drew aside the veil, behold the true Manning! Are canvas and paint the only requisites for a portrait? Does he who places the colors on the canvas so as to produce the features of a man set before us the likeness of an individual? Should not the true artist study anatomy, drawing, color, light? Should he not be a master of expression? Should he not know how to distinguish between those passing shadows on the faces of men that indicate conquered passions and that habitual cast of the features in repose that tells of the calm, virtuous soul? He who has not these qualifications should not touch brush or pen. Mr. Francis de Pressensé says that Mr. Purcell does not possess them, and therefore he should never have attempted to write the biography of Cardinal Manning.

The author of this refutation is a Frenchman, a Protestant, and the son of a Calvinist minister. He is certainly entirely disinterested, and writes from the pure motive of telling the truth.

This book is divided into three parts, consisting of an "Introduction," and treating of "Manning as an Anglican," and "Manning as a Catholic."

It is very interesting to all who wish to know the real Manning. Mr. Furey has very successfully introduced the French author to English readers, and the publisher has brought the book from the press in most becoming form.

---

PRIMAUTE DE SAINT JOSEPH D'APRES L'EPISCOPAT CATHOLIQUE ET LA THEOLOGIE.  
Par C. M., Prof. de Theologie. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, Rue Bonaparte, 90.  
1897. Pp. 513. Price, 6 francs.

One of the signs of the continuous adjustment to the social needs of humanity in the devotional life of the Church is the growing and deepening veneration paid by her children everywhere to the Holy Family,

and particularly to its human head, St. Joseph. How devotion to the foster father of Jesus Christ and the spouse of Mary develops and preserves the true ideal of family life—how it binds husband and wife and child into the closest union of a real home, no one with Christian instincts can fail to recognize. At a time, therefore, when this ideal is more and more disappearing from society, and respect for family ties is steadily diminishing, it is significant of the divine providence governing the Church that she should turn the minds and hearts of her children constantly, lovingly and actively to the true ideal of the family as reflected in the home of Joseph, the carpenter of Nazareth. The literature tending to foster the devotion to St. Joseph is not meagre, particularly in the various European languages, but the work here at hand is an addition thereto of quite a unique character. No devotion can solidly thrive and fruit unless it strike its roots deep into dogmatic truth. The appearance, therefore, of a work of this kind is a healthy sign of the strength and promise of endurance of the growing cult paid to St. Joseph, for the one purpose of the book is to unfold the theological principles in which that cult is rooted. The treatise falls, according to its title, into two main divisions. The first, on the Primacy of St. Joseph according to the teaching of the chief pastors of the Church, presents the conciliar and extra-conciliar acts of the universal Catholic episcopate, and of the sovereign pontiffs on this head. All this furnishes a basis for the succeeding theological argument. The second, and by far the larger part of the work (pp. 61–510), is taken up with an analysis of the theological principles bearing upon the paternity, dignity and sanctity of St. Joseph, his relation as spouse to Mary, his ministerial office, and the worship accorded him by the Church. The principles at the root of the three subjects are gathered, of course, from the Gospels, and unfolded in the light of ecclesiastical tradition. The work is not an aggregate of sermons, in the ordinary sense of this term, but a series of interconnected essays in which the doctrine of the Incarnation and the truths of ascetical theology are systematically expounded in their bearing on the primacy of St. Joseph. One who reads the book carefully will realize that much more is knowable about the head of the Holy Family than lies on the surface of the Gospel record. The deeper meaning and far-reaching consequences of the sacred texts are here brought out, and in such matters it is the *non multa sed multum* which has highest value.

---

THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL. Popular Sketches from Old Testament History. By *Carl Heinrich Cornill, D.D.* Translated by *Sutton F. Corkran*. Second edit. Chicago: The Open Court Publ. Co. 1897. Pp. xiv., 194. Pr. .25.

Prof. Cornill holds the chair of Old Testament history in the University of Königsburg. Though an "orthodox Christian," in the sense in which the qualification is taken in Germany, he is a worker in the fields of the "Higher Criticism," and in his present popular lectures on the Prophets of Israel has embodied the theories of Wellhausen, Kuenen, Duhm, and others of like tendencies. He writes reverently and with high admiration of the prophetic office, which, however, he deprives of its main supernatural function. The term prophet is ordinarily used of "one who predicts the future"—and the history of the Old Testament confirms this acceptance. "But, however widespread this view may be, and however generally the interpretation be accepted, it is nevertheless incorrect and in nowise just to the character and to the importance of the Israelitish prophecy" (p. 5). Though Prof. Cornill does not ex-

PLICITLY deny the popularly—we would prefer the traditionally—recognized element of prophecy, the inference from his etymology of the Hebrew *nabi* as synonymous with the Greek conception of *προφήτης*—that is, a messenger or an interpreter of the divine commands—practically ignores the element of prediction in prophetism.

Other traces of the results of the "Higher Criticism" are visible in his denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Ten Commandments, which latter he claims "were written in the first half of the seventh century, between 700 and 650 B. C." (p. 17), in his assertion of the Canaanitic origin of the Sabbath, but especially in his extremely positive pronouncement concerning the authorship of the latter portion of the Book of Isaiah. "It is now *generally admitted*," he says, "and may be regarded as one of the best established results of Old Testament research, that the portion of our present Book of Isaiah, which embraces Chapters 40 to 66, did not emanate from the prophet Isaiah known to us, but is the work of an *unknown prophet of the period towards the end of the Babylonian captivity*" (p. 131). When we couple this oracular statement with another no less final—namely, that "we know the very day, almost, when the Book of Daniel was written—*i.e.*, January, 164" (p. 177)—during the reign of the Maccabees—we cannot but infer that the author's restricted interpretation of prophetism is meant to serve the rationalistic theory which denies the prophet's prevision of future events, and this breaks down one of the main supports of supernatural revelation.

The work has the fault that is likely to go along with all small books on great subjects—considerable obscurity of thought and the bald assertion of unproven theories.

EDMUND CAMPION—A Biography. By *Richard Simpson*. New edition. John Hodges, Bedford Street, Strand, London.

THIS is a new and revised edition of the life of the English martyr. The author admits that Blessed Edmund Campion has had so many biographers that a new one may be expected to state his reasons for telling again a tale so often told. He says that in the course of his researches he found a quantity of unpublished matter that had never been seen by former biographers, and that in the earliest and most authentic memoirs many points were obscured by phrase-making, misunderstood through ignorance of England or misrepresented through the one-sidedness of those whose information was depended upon. Despite these reasons for the book's existence, the reader is surprised that this work forms one of the Catholic Standard Library—a collection of reliable, valuable books. There is something so unsatisfactory in its tone, that, coming from a Catholic writer, jars strangely upon us. Every attempt is made to clear the character of Elizabeth from the charge of cruelty or persecution, and she is represented as having little to do with the sufferings and death of the martyr. In almost every page the author practically admits that the Government was in a great measure justified in shedding the blood of the martyrs, for many of them were engaged in a treasonable conspiracy against the State. To give an example of the author's strange confusion of thought we will quote one of his pronouncements: "If Henry VIII. and Elizabeth had been treated with the same delicacy and circumspection that Lewis XIV. experienced, the end might have been different to what it was; and if Lewis had been treated like Henry VIII., the most Christian king would probably have proved as bad a churchman as the 'Defender of the Faith.'" No one who has the slightest

knowledge of history or of the totally different characters and circumstances of the monarchs compared will need comment on this.

Truly, if the writer's version were correct, the history of England would have to be re-written. As all the martyrs who are charged with being conspirators have been solemnly beatified, it is needless to say anything about them. Had Mr. Simpson lived to witness the verdict of the Holy See upon the most illustrious of them, and about whom he wrote so lightly, this work would never have been reprinted without correction. The erudition of the book is really remarkable, and will furnish, we hope, material for some future biographer.

SCIENCE AND THE CHURCH. By *Rev. F. A. Zahm, Ph.D., C.S.C.* Chicago: D. H. McBride & Co. 1896. Pp. 299. Price, \$1.50.

Doctor Zahm here brings together the essays which he had contributed during the past few years to various reviews and magazines. There is a certain generic unity running through them all that justifies the title "Science and the Church." A very slight change in the order of the chapters would have exhibited a perfect synthesis of thought in the first half of the volume and an analytical verification of the same in the second half. The two first chapters treat of the attitude and action of Leo XIII. in relation to science and the social question. Passing by the third chapter, the fourth and fifth show the genuine and large liberty enjoyed by the Catholic in the pursuit of science. The sixth pleads for a more thorough study of the physical sciences in our ecclesiastical seminaries. Thus far we have what we might style the synthetic portion of the work. The third chapter, on the history and present working of the Vatican Observatory, the seventh and eighth, on the two eminent Catholic scientists of recent years, Van Beneden and Pasteur, present the analytical data. One need not go beyond the life and work sketched in these chapters for verification of the principle unfolded in the preceding part of the book, that between true science and true faith there is truest harmony. The ninth chapter describes the system of writing for the blind invented by Mlle. Mulot. The tenth, on the Omar of the New World, is an able vindication of the venerable pioneer bishop of Mexico, Zumarraga, from the charges made against him by Robertson, Prescott, Hubert, Howe, Bancroft and other recent historians, of having been "an ignorant, fanatical iconoclast, the destroyer of a nation's records and the treasures of a new world's literature." The closing chapter presents the arguments for the opinion as to the site of the Garden of Eden, which places the terrestrial paradise at the head of the Persian Gulf, to the extreme south of ancient Babylonia.

HIS DIVINE MAJESTY, the Living God. By *William Humphrey, S.J.* London: Thomas Baker; New York: Benziger Bros. 1897. Pp. xxiii, 441. Price, \$2.50.

Father Humphrey has enriched the literature of Catholic theology and devotion with a number of solidly instructive works. Foremost in the former category are "The One Mediator" and "The Written Word." In the latter his "Elements of Religious Life," and especially his Digest of Suarez's treatise on the Religious State, deserve special commendation. His most recent work on the existence and nature of God may be said to do for dogmatic theology what his preceding work on "Conscience and Law," noticed in a former number of this REVIEW,

has done for moral. The main title of the present book will be familiar to readers of the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius, wherein the phrase occurs no fewer than twenty-four times. It signalizes the spirit in which the author has written. The sub-title, however, emphasizes more explicitly the strictly theological character of the work, which deals first with man's knowledge of God's existence and nature, then sets forth the theology of the divine essence and attributes of God's relation as Creator, as author of the natural and supernatural orders, and closes with an exposition of doctrine concerning the B. Trinity.

The author has gathered from dogmatic theology, following, as he tells us, particularly Frauzelin and Palmieri, the leading concepts and distinctions pertinent to these subjects, and explains them in terse English. The book will be of service to the serious student, who is unable or unwilling to study the matter treated in Latin works. It will interest not only Catholics but earnest Protestants of every denomination, and, let us hope with the author, "not only those who make profession of the Christian religion, but Jews, Mahommedans, Buddhists and other Unitarians—and even those to whom God is as yet unknown as a personal God, but who are seeking God, if, happily, they may feel after or find Him."

ABBE DE BROGLIE: QUESTIONS BIBLIQUES: ŒUVRE EXTRAITE D'ARTICLES DE REVUES ET DE DOCUMENTS INEDITS. Par M. l'Abbé C. Piat. Paris: Victor Lecoffre. 1897. P. vii., 408.

THEOLOGIA FUNDAMENTATIS AUCTORE IGN. OTTIGER, S. J. TOM I. DE "REVELATIONE SUPERNAT. Freiburg; Herder. St. Louis: 1897. Pp. xxiv., 928.

SOCIALISM AND CATHOLICISM FROM THE ITALIAN OF COUNT EDWARD SODERINI, By Richard Jenery-Shee. With a preface by Cardinal Vaughan. Longmans, Green & Co. New York: 1896. Pp. x., 343.

We are obliged to postpone to our next issue adequate reviews of these three important works. The first is a timely addition to the literature of Biblical Criticism. The editor, M. l'Abbé Piat, has made a systematized collection of the Abbé de Broglie's essays concerning the rationalistic theories centreing in the Pentateuch, the Origin of the Hebrew Nation, and the Prophets. It is hardly necessary to say that these essays are marked by that learning, argumentative force, originality of view, felicity of illustration and transparency of expression which characterized all the apologetical writings of de Broglie.

The second of the works at hand is the first in order of publication of a promised tri-volume course in Fundamental Theology. Judged by the character of this volume, the work bids fair to be a most exhaustive contribution to Apologetics.

It is well known that in Count Soderini's "*Socialismo e Cattolicismo*" the ethical and sociological principles of the Encyclical "*Rerum Novarum*" have received a luminous interpretation. English-speaking Catholics now possess a good translation of this important discussion of the Social Question in the light at once of sound ethical and economical principles and of the authoritative teaching of the Church.

THE FORMATION OF CHRISTENDOM. By T. W. Allies, K. C. S. G. London: Burns & Oates, Limited. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1897.

All lovers of solid Catholic literature will give a cordial greeting to the reappearance, in a cheap and popular edition, of Allies's great work, which has hitherto appealed only to a select audience, owing to

the costliness of the first edition. As Cardinal Vaughan has justly observed, "we have nothing like it in the English language;" nor, we may add, in any other language except the Latin of the *De Civitate Dei*. Allies is a noble follower of St. Augustine, and his volumes have the additional merit of supplying present needs without obliging us to linger over the long refutations of old exploded errors which makes his great master so difficult to read. The subject treated by both authors is the same, namely, the revolution effected in the individual and in society by the introduction of Christianity. All the literature pertaining to the theme has been carefully studied and skilfully employed by Allies, and his work approaches as near to perfection as it is given to human energy and eloquence to attain. It is truly a monumental work, and will grow in general esteem with the advance of thought. There is no prospect that it will ever be superseded.

To date, three volumes have issued from the press. The subject-matter of the first volume is "The Christian Faith and the Individual." The second treats of "The Christian Faith and Society." The third discusses "The Christian Faith and Philosophy." The remaining volumes will appear in the near future, and the total will furnish our ecclesiastical students and cultured laity with an impregnable and exhaustive series of arguments to the truth of Catholic Christianity. We cheerfully re-echo the wish of His Eminence of Westminster that the work be adopted as a text-book in all our seminaries. Let it at least be read repeatedly in the refectories.

---

GESCHICHTE DES DEUTSCHEN VOLKES seit dem dreizehnten Jahrhundert bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. Freiburg and St. Louis; Herder. 1897. Von *Emil Michael, S.J.*

The distinguished Professor of Church History at the University of Innsbruck has undertaken to do for the Germany of the Middle Ages the same work of careful and detailed investigation which the immortal Janssen performed for the Germany of the Reformation era. His labors are professedly an introduction to Janssen, and in every respect modelled after his master. We congratulate him upon his subject; for, with every reservation demanded by history, the period he treats of was pre-eminently a glorious one, and his narrative chronicles the vast advance made in Central Europe under the benign influence of the Christian Church. Even the first volume—necessarily of a preliminary character—shows the vital indebtedness of Germany to the Church for the progress made in the social, economical and legal conditions of the nation from the twelfth to the fourteenth century. The enfranchisement of the peasantry, the cultivation of the soil, the formation of the cities, the improvement in the arts and sciences, the pushing forward of the boundaries of the empire was mainly the work of the Church through the agency of her religious orders, her strict organization and her unwavering promulgation of the principles of Christian civilization. Whilst, therefore, Janssen was the chronicler of the decay of German culture under the withering blight of Lutheranism, Dr. Michael has chosen the better part, and narrates the story of constant progress during the ages of divine faith.

We recognize in Dr. Michael a worthy disciple of Janssen. He has the same painstaking spirit, and displays an erudition which is simply amazing. We shall look forward anxiously to the completion of the great work, which will undoubtedly effect as complete a revolution in the popular estimate of the condition of things in mediæval times as the labors of his predecessors did with regard to the consequences of the Lutheran Reformation.

THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791. The original French, Latin and Italian Texts, with English Translations and Notes; Illustrated by Portraits, Maps and Facsimiles. Edited by *Reuben Gold Thwaites*, Secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Vol. V. Quebec: 1632-1633. Vol. VI. Quebec: 1633-1634. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company.

The learned editors and the enterprising publishers of this great undertaking are fulfilling all their promises with remarkable dispatch and conscientiousness. The fifth and sixth volumes are already before us, and the most fastidious critic would find it difficult to speak of them otherwise than in words of enthusiastic praise.

The hero of the present volumes is Father Le Jeune, who was appointed superior of the Jesuit mission in New France in the year 1632, and whose Relations to his Provincials are models of simple and unaffected correspondence. We doubt whether it would be possible for the greatest masters of style to improve upon his unambitious narrative, which places the weird scenes through which he passes so vividly before our eyes. With each succeeding volume the ever-changing and ever-widening drama of the evangelization of the American savages increases in interest.

---

ROME AND ENGLAND; OR, ECCLESIASTICAL CONTINUITY. By *Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A.* London: Burns & Oates, Lim. New York: Benziger Brothers.

A new work by Father Rivington is an event of extreme interest in the controversy between the Apostolic See and the schismatical Church of England. The subject treated by the distinguished convert from Anglicanism is one of which he is thoroughly master, and therefore he wastes neither his own time nor that of his readers in the discussion of secondary issues, but comes at once to the point, clearly lays down his thesis, and proceeds with his proofs in a manner that must carry conviction to every mind pervious to argument. His present thesis is the utter lack of continuity between modern Anglicanism and the Church of the Anselms and Grossetestes of ancient days. A wonderful amount of erudition and logic has been condensed into this little book of less than two hundred pages. The only way to answer such a treatise is the way which Father Rivington's opponents invariably adopt, that of silently ignoring it.

---

NOVA ET VETERA: Informal Meditations for Times of Spiritual Dryness. By *George Tyrrell, S.J.* London: Longmans, Green & Co.

Under this unpretentious title Father Tyrrell furnishes us with a very valuable remedy against a widespread complaint, for spiritual dryness is a dreary malady of frequent occurrence. Though our author calls his work a book of meditations, it is such only in the sense in which Pascal's "*Pensées*" or the "*Imitation*" could be so denominated. There is a total absence of the formalities of preludes, colloquies, and the like. The thoughts are presented without preface or ceremony, and each one is permitted to evolve it according to his spiritual needs. Neither is there any pretence at method or consecutiveness, for, as the author wisely observes, "In hours of dryness and weariness we naturally turn from the monotony of method to seek relief and variety in the unexpected, as one might occasionally fly from the geometrical precision of a Dutch garden to the freedom of some pathless wilderness." It is a book which one can open anywhere, with the certainty of finding something that will afford him consolation and instruction.

PIUS VII., 1800—1823. By *Mary H. Allies*. London: Burns & Oates, Limited, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

Any one who has read Miss Allies's "Pre-Reformation England" will gladly welcome this addition to the world of books. In sixteen chapters she tells the story of twenty-three years of the Church's trials. So vividly is the life of the Holy Father portrayed that the interest and feelings of the reader are constantly with him, from the memorable coronation scenes of Napoleon at Notre Dame to the lonely old man exiled at Savona. Pius VII. was certainly not the man that human wisdom would have suggested for Pope, yet his simplicity and holiness of life overcame the most forceful worldly-wise character of the world. One closes the book with the words of the Holy Father ringing in one's ears: "No material force in the world can combat a moral force," and the heart beats faster with love for the Holy Catholic Church.

There is a pleasure in store for the readers of Miss Allies's "Pius VII."

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

CHRISTLICHE IKONOGRAPHIE. Ein Handbuch zum Verstaendniss der Christlichen Kunst. Von *Heinrich Detzel*. Zweiter (Schluss) Band: Die bildlichen Darstellungen der Heiligen. Mit 318 Abbildungen. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, net, \$3.25.

MANUAL OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST. Conferences on the Blessed Sacrament and Eucharistic Devotions, with Prayers for Mass, etc. *Rev. F. X. Lasance*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Price, 75 cents.

CARDINAL MANNING. From the French of Francis de Pressensé. By *E. Ingall*. London: William Heinemann. Received from B. Herder, St. Louis. Price, \$1.25.

LIBRI LITURGICI BIBLIOTHECÆ APOSTOLICÆ VATICANÆ MANUSCRIPTI: Digessit et Recensuit *Hugo Ehrensberger*. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1897. Price, \$8.25.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION AND AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS. By *Rev. John F. Mullany, LL.D.*, with preface by the *Most Rev. Francis Janssens, D.D.*

SAINT JOSEPH'S ANTHOLOGY. Poems in Praise of the Foster-Father, Gathered from many Sources. By the *Rev. Matthew Russell, S.J.* Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1897.

CATHOLIC GEMS AND PEARLS. A Variety of Articles on Catholic Subjects with Miscellaneous Readings. By *Rev. J. Phelan*. Vol. I. Chicago: J. S. Hyland & Co.

HEART TONES AND OTHER POEMS. *D. O'Kelly Brandan*. The Peter Paul Book Company: Buffalo, N. Y.



